# THE Lutheran Quarterly

ume VIII NOVEMBER, 1956 Number 4

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

*Editor*
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

*Managing Editor*
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

*Book Editor*
WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

*Circulation Manager*
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

## EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

## AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume VIII NOVEMBER, 1956 Number 4

## CONTENTS

THIS IS THE PREACHER'S HOUR ..... *Alvin N. Rogness* 291

THE AWAKENING OF POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY AMONG GERMAN PROTESTANTS ..... *Rodney Hokenson* 296

PATRIOTIC ACTIVITY OF CALVINISTIC AND LUTHERAN CLERGYMEN DURING THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION ..... *Dagobert de Levie* 319

LUTHERANS AND NON-DENOMINATIONAL YOUTH MOVEMENTS, *Leslie Conrad, Jr.* 341

MARTIN WERNER AND "ANGEL CHRISTOLOGY" ..... *John Reumann* 349

LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

Sweden: Methodology in Sweden ..... *Eric H. Wahlstrom* 359
Finland: Lars Levi Laestadius ..... *Jacob W. Heikkinen* 360
America: Directions in Lutheran Losses ..... *Theodore G. Tappert* 362

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Wentz, *Basic History of Lutheranism in America* (E. L. Fevold) ..... 365
Knudsen, *Danish Rebel: Life of N. F. S. Grundtvig* (B. Christensen) ..... 366
Nielsen, *N. F. S. Grundtvig: an American Study* (W. D. Allbeck) ..... 367
Forell, *Ethics of Decision* (Otto A. Bremer) ..... 368
Bonhoeffer, *Ethics* (T. A. Kantonen) ..... 369
Nygren, *Kristus och hans kyrka* (Conrad Bergendoff) ..... 370
Tillich, *Biblical Religion and the Search for Reality* (G. W. Forell) ..... 371
Croxall, *Meditations from Kierkegaard* (R. Thomte) ..... 372
Kierkegaard, *On Authority and Revelation* (R. Thomte) ..... 373
Nygren, *Christ and His Church* (E. M. Carlson) ..... 376
Bultmann, *Essays Philosophical and Theological* (S. L. Olsen) ..... 378

# CONTRIBUTORS

Alvin N. Rogness is professor of Practical Theology and president of Luther Seminary in St. Paul.

Rodney Hokenson is interne in Immanuel Church (United Lutheran) in Bellevue, Nebraska.

Dagobert de Levie is associate professor of German in the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Leslie Conrad, Jr., is executive secretary of the Luther League of America, youth organization of the United Lutheran Church.

John Reumann is assistant professor of New Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary.

Reporters on "Life and Thought in World Lutheranism" in this number include Eric H. Wahlstrom, professor of the New Testament in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois, and Jacob W. Heikkinen, professor of the New Testament in the Gettysburg (Pennsylvania) Seminary.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are Bernhard Christensen, president of Augsburg College and Seminary, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Willard D. Allbeck, professor of Church History in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; Otto A. Bremer, student pastor at the University of California, Berkeley, California; T. A. Kantonen, professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; Conrad Bergendoff, president of Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois; George W. Forell, associate professor in the School of Religion of the State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Reidar Thomte, professor of Philosophy in Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota; Edgar M. Carlson, president of Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minnesota.

# This Is the Preacher's Hour

By Alvin N. Rogness

THEOLOGY is no longer the avocation of the intellectuals, the luxury of scholars smoking their pipes before the fire. Theology lurks in the laboratories of the nuclear scientist, intrudes itself into the world of the statesman, gets entangled in the roadside philosophy of the truckdriver, finds its way into the cowboy ballads of the lover.

In the middle twentieth century, when the taut sense of crisis has replaced the happy mood of progress, the question of God, man, and existence has stormed the stage of history as perhaps never before. If civilization will fail to survive, we have a fearful suspicion that it will not be because we do not know how to keep it going, but because we do not know *why* it should be kept going. Existence itself is on trial, and in the twentieth century courtroom it is not the technician who presents the brief; it is the philosopher, the poet, and the theologian who have been engaged as counsel for defense and prosecution. There is an urgent intuition welling up among the children of men that we cannot let matters drift—we cannot rest back in happy yielding to history's resident or inherent push toward progress, we cannot sit by and wait for utopia. Mischief-makers may play with fire-crackers packing thousands of megatons of punch, and the age of man may be over.

The cry is for implementing whatever spiritual and moral forces we may have. We press history for its lessons, not because we dote on the past; we probe man for his nature and resources, not because we have a schoolboy's curiosity to explore; we scan the heavens for a sign, not because we have the astrologer's fascination for the stars; we open the book of Scriptures, not because we like Greek and Hebrew syntax. There is a feverish urgency in the entire pursuit because the great questions of ultimate meaning and humanity's resources have left the halls of the professors to become the prior commodity of the market place.

If ever the preacher of the Gospel has had a hearing it is today. It is a dreadful moment for him. For if he wallows aimlessly in the historic past, if he entrenches himself in ancient forms and snarls his

protest against a formless present, if he prattles pretty platitudes in this electric courtroom, or if he runs feverishly about emptying spittoons and sharpening lead pencils when the great judge has called the trial to order, more than any other man of the hour the preacher will have betrayed God and the age. The caution of James, "Let not many of you be teachers," has a fearful relevance today. And he who has accepted the call and received the commission to be shepherd and prophet had better have at least the pathos of the scientist and the statesman in sensing that now is the acceptable time, now is the day of the Lord. Night is coming; the bird has but a little way to flutter, and the bird is on the wing.

On the Dakota prairies I have watched the summer sky as the storms hovered and swirled above the landscape. The most intriguing aspect of the sight was the clouds in seething and distracting surge, as if winds from north and south, east and west, were all in fierce combat for control of the heavens. Or I have watched a pheasant in the path of the hunter, darting first left and then right, fleeing ahead and then sensing new danger, reversing its course and speeding back.

In this hour of world crisis, ideologies, philosophies, and theologies are in engrossing ferment. But wherever there is ferment, there is hope, for ferment is symptom of search, of pathos—and has the promise of discovery. Seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened. To squat and cluck contentedly in today's hour may be the most wanton betrayal of all.

This is the preacher's hour. For over a century it has been the technician's hour, but now even the scientist has turned preacher. The proud house of our technical knowledge and creation trembles on foundations already shaking, and man turns in upon himself to explore new ground and dimensions for his own existence. If his house crashes in upon him, must he, too, perish? If his planet drops out from under him, must he, too, plunge into the abyss? Or is man ultimately immune from the plight of his house and his world?

Under less threatening skies, long ago, the Psalmist begins his rhapsody, "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained, what is man, that thou art mindful of him. . .?" Today we might give these lines grim paraphrase and say, "When I consider the heavens, from which the bombs may fall; when I consider the earth, where universal death may rule

in solitary sovereignty—what is man, that even then he may have life and worth?"

In the world of thought, this preoccupation with man is currently labeled "existentialism." However difficult of precise definition, this prevailing habit displays a concern for man, the subject, over against the world or universe as object. Its method is largely anti-intellectual, over against the presuppositions of logic or of scientific empiricism. It turns in upon man himself as a self-contained world. While existentialism thus parades as a type of philosophy or manner of thought, it is so flexible in its forms as to include the atheism of a Sartre, the Catholicism of a Marcel, the Protestantism of a Kierkegaard, the Judaism of a Buber, and the Orthodoxy of a Berdyaev. In all these forms man is no longer exiled from reality, as he is with the logical positivists who limit knowledge to abstract propositions of mathematics and logic and to historical and scientific statements which can be verified by observation. With the existentialist the subjective reactions of man himself become central. And this climate is far more native to the poet and the theologian. For in this climate man is far more willing to seek answers not in the findings of laboratories but—perhaps—in the Word of God. Perhaps there is a Word that is beyond nature itself, addressed to man from God.

Robert Ingersoll, in a day when a man could be agnostic with more leisure and less passion than today, said, "Life is but a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights; we cry aloud, and the only answer is the echo of our wailing cry."

The preacher boldly declares that there is more than an echo. For those who have ears to hear, there is a Voice, and the Voice is the Word of God. And the preacher's task is so to declare this Word of God that man, the subject, encounters God, the subject, and in the encounter becomes the object of God's judgment and mercy.

It is inconceivable that the preacher can succeed unless he himself first has made the encounter and lives in daily communion with God. Whatever else a congregation or an age may expect of him, they have the right to expect that he himself be a man of God. The blind cannot lead the blind, and the searcher can do little more than identify himself with the lost and join in their groping in the dark. This is the sad plight of existentialism apart from the Gospel. To have found the pearl of great price, to have been found of the pursuing Saviour, and

to live daily in fellowship with him—these are the elemental qualifications of the shepherd and the preacher.

It is when the preacher himself lives in the Word, so that daily by the Holy Spirit he knows his own deep sinfulness, daily approaches God in sorrow and contrition, daily stands in wonder before the Cross of Christ and his forgiveness, daily is drawn into the stream of radical gratitude for grace, daily lives in the power of a new life in Christ, and daily walks in expectant tip-toe for Christ's return—it is then and to that degree that he becomes a mighty voice for God's Word to men.

This is the preacher's hour, not because after twenty centuries we have found a new or refined Gospel, not because after twenty centuries man has become more competent or willing to hear the full Gospel, but because man's extremity has left a void and a silence which the din and distractions of the day cannot fill. Thousands will fill our pews on Sunday not only from habit or good custom, but in the vague and wistful hope that they may hear a Word from God.

The preacher has this Word to give. It is an utterly simple word; it is a staggeringly profound word. It is the story of a God who in creation, redemption, and sanctification has left his glory above to capture and exalt sinful man, because he loved him so. The story reaches its sublime climax in this fallen world in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

At his mother's knee a child learns how this Jesus, ruler of wind and wave, came to save. And a little girl, two years of age, lisps her faith, perhaps in the familiar Sunday school verse "Jesus loves me, this I know, for the Bible tells me so." Lying in her bed at night, she hears the storm, the crash of thunder, the flash of lightning, the roaring of wind and rain—and she closes her weary lids unafraid because "Jesus loves me, this I know. . . ."

Her father in the next room hears his own storm raging—the anxieties of business, the temptations of the midday struggles, the remorse of the day, the fears of unknown tomorrows. He, too, finally comes to terms with his storm and falls asleep essentially on the same simple refrain, "Jesus loves me, this I know. . . ."

Her grandfather, life's span almost gone and the sun casting its last long shadows toward the east, also finds peace for departure in the same simple and sublime faith, "Jesus loves me, this I know. . . ."

I have always liked Brahm's *Lullabye,* even when played with one finger. I once heard it played as a concerto, with orchestra. It began

with one finger, then the pianist added a chord, and another, until the full instrument sustained the melody. Then the orchestral parts began to fall in, one after another, until piano and orchestra swelled into a rich and glorious symphony. Gradually the orchestration subsided, until the piano was alone, and finally the performance ended with the tender beauty of the one finger refrain again. But even in the moment of full orchestration, there would have been no symphony had not the whole been sustained by the simple one-finger motif.

The Gospel has a simple refrain: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth on him shall not perish but have everlasting life." It is as simple and concise as that. But it has a fullness and a mystery which no human organ has yet exhausted or articulated.

Twenty years of formal education go into the making of the preacher, twenty years to prepare for a solid one-finger performance. If somewhere he loses the single, central refrain, all the chords and instrumentation he commands will be betrayal. On the other hand, into this Gospel and its elemental power for salvation he is to weave all his ministry. Whatever he may command of reflective powers—in theology, philosophy, history, literature, arts and sciences—is to enrich, broaden, deepen, and exalt this message of judgment and mercy, law and gospel. Whatever capacities we have for organization, administration, human relations, group dynamics, and community leadership is to be interwoven into the one strident motif. Men cannot live, nor dare they die, by any other. Let this ministry of the Gospel slip from its center and our ministry, however statistically impressive to a casual world, will be no symphony but, in Macbeth's words, will be a "tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

The formal church membership in our country is approaching the unprecedented figure of 100,000,000. Other millions are waiting and hoping. This is not an age of itching ears, but a day of fearful and longing hearts. It is the preacher's hour.

God give us love—love of him and great compassion for men. God give us social skills, a competence to deal with a world grown smaller but far more complex. God give us churchmanship, an awareness of the role of the organized church in our day. Above all, God make us preachers, with hearts of a disciple and the courage of an apostle—to bring the Word of the living God to men.

# The Awakening of Political Responsibility Among German Protestants

*By Rodney Hokenson*

A SINGULAR phenomenon in post-war Germany has been the extremely important role played by the churches in the shaping of a new political outlook. The role assumed by Roman Catholics is largely a continuation of policies inaugurated in the middle of the nineteenth century; the modern German state has had a strong and independent voice from that side ever since Bishop Ketteler inaugurated social and political activity on behalf of the working classes. In the case of Protestants, however, a new precedent has been established. Its emergence was formulated by a Pastor Lutze in Wuppertal in 1945 when he said, "One cannot hold fast to the principle of the Bismarck era that Christianity has nothing to seek in the political arena. The synods of the 'confessing church' in the Hitler era consciously rejected this false concept."

Behind this statement lies the difficult awakening of responsible Protestant leaders to the realization of the tragic depths to which their quietism in political affairs had allowed their country to sink. Behind it lies also the realization that the modern state in the Christian West does not automatically bear the attributes of a just government, such as Luther envisaged in his political views on obedience to the ruling powers.[1] Inherent in this rejection of quietism is a rediscovery of the need to apply the great principles behind the specific and time-bound views of Luther to the changing pattern of events in today's world.

In many ways we are still too close to the post-war period to evaluate this transformation. It is far too complex a problem for one to attempt to demonstrate, in one short study, either the back-

1 The importance of Luther as a formative voice in German political development is well recognized by nearly all scholars, but there is wide divergence in interpreting the nature and direction of this influence. Cf. George Forell's discussion of problems of interpretation and consequent misunderstandings of Luther's social and political views in *Faith Active in Love* (New York, 1954), especially Chap. II, "The Problem," where the footnotes are very helpful.

ground against which this basic transformation should be seen or all the specific forms in which it can be observed. It shall be my purpose merely to indicate certain significant steps along the way to responsible citizenship in the modern world which some German Protestant leaders have taken and are taking.

## I. Historical and Ideological Origins

Considering the volumes of debate over the early influences shaping the Protestant political outlook in Germany, it is necessary to realize how simple it is to read into Luther or other Reformers particular teachings which actually grew out of interpretations of some later era. In trying to work from the peculiar phenomenon of a given period back to its roots in the Reformation, it is a common error to bypass the theological point of view which the Reformation sought to assert.

It is commonly asserted, for instance, that Luther fostered separate morality for private and societal behavior by his conception of the two kingdoms.[2] The basis of this doctrine is found in Luther's understanding of the several functions through which God exercises rule over his creation. The "worldly" and the "spiritual" realms are not meant to denote any given, determinable divisions but rather certain functions in God's government of the world. Both "realms" are subject to the corruption of the demonic, but both stand under God's almighty power. "Everything that Luther says about the *Weltregiment* of God has as a point of departure the realization of the presence and activity of satanic might in this world."[3] Since God has instituted his holy Law to sustain the world against the demonic, it is of crucial importance that men participate in God's plan by contributing to the just ordering of life. Since this is done by man's natural reason, the jurisdiction over the political and social life of the community is best exercised by the magistrates and rulers to whom exercise of wisdom, reason, and judgment is given. These are bound by their office to rule and judge according to immutable, divine law and not by arbitrary

2 The kingdom of this world and that of Christ. This conception is closely related to and indebted to Augustine's "City of God" and "City of the Earth," which are contrary principles, neither of which exists on earth in an actual form. Cf. Walter Künneth, *Politik Zwischen Daemon und Gott* (Berlin, 1954), pp. 72 ff.

3 Künneth, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

judgment, and it is the duty of every Christian constantly to remind them of this. "Christ has instructed us preachers not to withhold the truth from the lords, but to exhort and chide them in their injustice. . . . We recognize the [God-given] authority, but we must rebuke our Pilates in their crime and self-confidence."[4]

All this is rehearsed here to show the reason why, in the crumbling world of his day, Luther should turn to the Christian princes and trust them for the just ordering of life. For him the masses of men were swayed only by ignorance and passion and were in no position to pass on what was good or wise for the community. Because the peasants were in a state of revolt and unrest, partly because of his own writings, Luther (and consequently early Lutheranism) came to rely heavily upon the power of the existing princes for the ordering of society. Theocracy was never a part of the Lutheran view, but since "he was not resigned to a secularized culture"[5] and declined to see church and state go separate ways as if they had nothing in common, Luther was leaving the door open, if only a crack, to caesaropapism.

This tendency grew as the life of the Protestant churches in Germany developed into more complex forms. With the authority of the Roman hierarchy rejected, there was need to turn to some new force to establish and maintain order in the church. The princes, besides holding secular leadership, were also leading members of the church in their territories, and so the practice arose very early of designating them *Notbischöfe* (emergency bishops) in their own lands. Under their direction, and responsible to them, were various advisory councils and consistories. The consequence was that all appointments of pastors became entangled in the machinery of government. What had for Luther been an emergency measure, used with considerable scepticism and a realization of the dangers, became established practice in the Protestant churches[6] As the states grew in bureaucratic formality, the churches became increasingly incapable of acting on their own

4 *W.A.*, XIX, p. 657.

5 Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand* (New York, 1955), p. 188.

6 In order to establish peace and a semblance of order in the church in Saxony, Elector Frederick was requested in 1527 to appoint a visitation committee. This he did, with Luther named to head it and theologians and jurists to handle the spiritual and financial problems encountered in the churches. In the preface to the visitation articles by Melanchthon, Luther had stressed "the provisional nature of the whole plan" (Bainton). The Elector, however, referred to the Commissioners as "My Visitors," and the tone of the articles was less a questionnaire than a program to be instituted.

volition. Pastors, paid by the states, were part of the *Obrigkeit* to whom obedience was to be paid, and they were an integral part of the aristocratic class. The original, dynamic understanding of the Word of God also gradually hardened into dogmatic systems which were lacking in warmth and unreceptive to creative interpretation.

It must be noted, in the light of later developments that tended to harden German Protestantism into conservative and even reactionary support of dynastic, nationalistic powers, that "the main concern of Protestants at all times was not for any particular *form* of the state, but for liberty to practice what they conceived to be the true religion. . . . One might say that, for all Protestants, religion transcended politics, and the chief concern was to give free course to the Word of God."[7] In the modern development of Christian political parties in Europe, the same principle has been at work.[8]

The recent history of the church in many countries shows an effort by many churches to extricate themselves from political systems in which they have been entangled. Thus they would put into practice the principles of freedom inherent in the Reformation but stifled for so long by an inadequate understanding of the very principles from which they have grown. Certainly this effort can be clearly seen in the homeland of the Reformation.

## II. The Burden of Nineteenth Century Conservatism

The development toward aristocratic conservatism by the Protestant churches, mentioned above, continued into the modern world.

7 Bainton, *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (Boston, 1952), pp. 230-231, 234. This scholar contradicts the assumptions by Ernst Troeltsch and a host of his followers that Lutheranism *per se* led to conservative, aristocratic political conceptions and Calvinsim to democracy. Citing, among others, the example of the Lutheran countries of Scandinavia, which have had a long liberal tradition, and the political inconsistency of French Huguenots (Reformed), who varied from royalism to insurrection with the changing attitude of the various monarchs toward Protestantism, he concludes "that in these instances circumstances had more effect than religion upon the political theory of religious bodies." The same inconsistency could be pointed out in Roman Catholic political outlook, which varies considerably from one country to another, depending largely upon whether it is in the majority or minority.

8 Cf. Karl Buchheim, *Geschichte der Christlichen Parteien* (Munich, 1953), p. 9: "Das Prinzip aller christlichen Parteiarbeit ist nicht Reaktion, nicht Widerstreben gegen den lebendigen Geist, sondern Kampf für die Freiheit der Kirche und des ihr verpflichteten Gewissens." This would appear to be a rather negative *Prinzip* to enter into the political arena. This statement is hardly adequate to indicate much of the social program which inspired some of the more liberal Christian parties.

As long as life in Germany rested solidly upon the patriarchal foundations of an agrarian and guild economy, there was little to challenge it. But with the rapid development of the Industrial Revolution during the nineteenth century, and with the principles of nationalism and centralism gaining ascendancy in statecraft, Protestant conservatism was to be put to the test. There were forces being loosed that were shaking the foundations of this solid society based upon the intimate contact of peasant and landowner, servant and master, or apprentice and guild master. The test facing Christian churches was whether they could safely weather the storms of a new age and adapt their program and methods to a society that was so vastly different from that in which they had lived for so many hundred years.

However the churches in other lands might have been faring, the Protestant churches in Germany found it no simple task to adjust to changing conditions in the last century. In an age of shaking foundations, it was perhaps natural that those advocating conservative retention of the old forms of expression should solidify their position to the exclusion of those who, sensing the changes in Western civilization, wished to adjust to them. The latter often had to accept the conclusion that the church had no message to give to the modern world, so they left the church behind and took their program into organizations and societies beyond the pale of ecclesiastical influence.

The eighteenth century Enlightenment in Germany had engendered several counter movements. Pietism was the attempt to restore feeling and warmth to religion, where cold Rationalism and Orthodoxism had usurped their places. In another aspect, German Romanticism, gaining momentum at the turn of the century, "in its endeavor to span all the heights and depths of being, . . . [was] engaged in a restless search for a wished for totality, moving from one extreme to another, . . . always overstating its case, always on the way but never at rest."[9] These related movements toward immediate, subjective experience, whether of God or of "life" in the mystical, romantic sense, opened many doors to extremity. It is difficult, for instance, to separate the theological premise of Schleiermacher, that it is more important to describe the phenomena of one's subjective experience of God than to inquire into the nature of God and his will, from the

9 Kurt Reinhardt, *Germany, 2,000 Years* (Milwaukee, 1950), p. 469.

revolutionary conclusions of Feuerbach. This philosopher maintained, with great intellectual force, "that God and the entire realm of the supernatural were a creation of man's hopes and fears. . . . God was created in the image and likeness of man. . . . Man . . . must not search for [happiness] above himself but within himself: theology must be transformed into anthropology."[10]

It can easily be seen that, if the importance of religion is seen mainly in the degree to which it engenders a feeling or an emotion, the prophetic role of religion is suppressed. The absence of this prophetic character was thrown into stark relief by the catapulting of German society into the Industrial Age. As new machines were developed for manufacturing goods, cities multiplied and their populations packed into whatever housing could be found already available or could be thrown up around the factories. The evils attendant on the early days of the factory and wage systems are well known and need not be enumerated. For the most part, workers left small parishes in the country, and the parishes in the cities, fixed usually by geographical division, now took on immense, almost astronomical, proportions. The pastors and other church leaders could not begin to keep in contact with church members.[11] These masses of men, huddled into such large cities, lost their identity and were submerged into one vast "proletariat" which did not even have the distinction of being considered a "class" in society. This gave an unheard of degree of freedom of choice to the individual who was used to the tradition-bound atmosphere of villages and towns. It was, however, a freedom that was bounded by its own terrors, especially the uncertainty engendered by the tenuous "wage," which was "the only tangible link between man and his oppressive urban world." But if the parish could not keep up with its members, other groups were interested in them.

The very burden of freedom made factory workers turn to socialist counselors.

10 Reinhardt, *op. cit.*, p. 557.

11 Cf. William Shanahan, *German Protestants Face the Social Question, 1815-1871*, I (Notre Dame, 1954), p. 354. After 1860 building of churches could no longer keep up with population, and by the 1880's there were some parishes of over 100,000 members and a parish of 25,000 to 40,000 was not unusual. In this situation, Shanahan states, pastors usually knew only a few upper-class members who were of like educational status. Berlin saw the earliest and most thorough estrangement of its masses from the church, with only two per cent of the people in 1867 attending Sunday worship. (Presumably this figure refers to regular attendance.) Reference will be made extensively to this study by Shanahan, since it is the most authoritative recent work on the subject.

Socialism offered bewildered proletarians the moral encouragement of an ultimate historical purpose, and a sense of community . . . strongly resembling the Christian parish. Mystery had gone out of the life of men and women huddled by the thousands in sordid barracks. They appeared to have been abandoned by everyone save the Social Democratic and Lassallean zealots. Through its ministrations and its doctrines the Social Democratic Party became the visible church of a secular religion.[12]

This usurping of the central place once given to a religious *Weltanschauung* did not come as the end of a debate between Christianity and Socialism, but rather it was the end result of the seeming irrelevance, in the new society, of Christianity as it had been known in villages. The socialist leaders tended toward anticlericalism and atheism but took no definite position until, in 1891, the Social Democrats stated it as official policy that "religion is a private affair," subtly implying thereby that religion is not determinative in the affairs of society.[13]

In 1848 John Wichern delivered a manifesto to German Protestants regarding their social responsibility. The occasion was the gathering of churchmen at the Wittenberg *Kirchentag* for the discussion of church union. Before mid-century, under the stimulus of the awakening (*Erweckungsbewegung*) that had stirred the upper classes with a new religious fervor, many charitable and missionary enterprises were launched which came to be called the Inner Mission.[14]

12 *Ibid.*, pp. 345 ff. There was a vaguely defined workers movement in the late '50's, given its first cohesive platform by the organizing efforts of Ferdinand Lassalle and his followers. His main concerns at the outset were for universal manhood suffrage and for state financed producers' cooperatives. The Roman Catholic labor movement began about this time also. Various non-Catholic unions, organized in the first years of the '60's, were joined in 1864 into the Federation of German Labor Unions. After *Das Kapital* appeared in 1867, the leadership became Marxist in orientation. The Lassalle groups were less inclined to the radicalism of Marxian philosophy. The Federation, with its political counterpart in the Social Democratic Party, was committed quite strongly to achieving its ends through parliamentary and not revolutionary means. The classless utopia was still the goal.

13 *Ibid.*, especially note, p. 348, describing the conscious use by Socialists of religious categories and methods of religious propagation, such as the *Reiseprediger,* similar to the circuit rider in the American frontier's religious development.

14 Cf. Paul Means, *Things That Are Caesar's* (New York, 1935), p. 13 ff. The Pietistic Awakening had its greatest influence among the upper class and intellectuals and was allied with political conservatism. This is in sharp contrast to the comparable movement, Methodism, in England, which appealed to the masses and was associated with their interests. German Pietism fostered individual conversion and a retreat into personal morality and discipline, but was still oriented toward the church and the use of the sacraments. Means quotes Oswald Spengler as stressing the importance of Pietism in molding the disciplined, self-sacrificing, old Prussian officer type.

Wichern, a pastor from Hamburg who had begun to help the distressed classes, was given opportunity to deliver a stirring message in which he pleaded for official church recognition and support of Inner Mission endeavors. As a result of this plea a Central Committee for the Inner Mission was authorized which should have jurisdiction over such activities and promote them in any way possible. This Committee was steered into the channels of Pietistic political conservatism by the members appointed, all of whom were active in conservative politics, including various ministers in the Prussian government. The treatise written by Wichern as the platform for the Central Committee in 1849 was likewise reactionary in tone, associating "sin" with economic "privation," democracy with godlessness, and calling any revolution against existing authority the work of Satan. The Inner Mission, it was said, should join the state in seeking to preserve social discipline.

From this point on, Wichern's zeal for promoting reform and social responsibility was drawn more and more into the fiber of Prussian political conservatism. Support was given by rulers and the aristocracy, making the Inner Mission heavily dependent on their generous contributions. Having condemned the 1848 attempt of liberal elements to overthrow the government, the Inner Mission set itself solidly in the camp of an aristocracy which was somewhat bothered about relieving the distress of the proletariat but unable to attack the causes of distress.[15]

The conservatives of the old school were alienated from the major line of political and social development in most of Germany when the National Liberals and the Progressives came into their own as bulwarks of the *Realpolitik* of Bismarck, a policy of blood and iron. Nearly all segments of society were awed by the military and political strength which the new policies gave to a now united Fatherland. But it was a

15 Gerhardt, Martin: *Ein Jahrhundert Innere Mission. Dis Geschichte des Central-Ausschusses für die Innere Mission der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche* (Gütersloh, 1948), 2 vols. Some of the activities were: pastoral work with migratory workers, including those in France and Holland; poor relief; prison missions; evangelizing and tracts; city missions; hospitals; rescue houses (268 of these by 1868); youth associations; orphanages; missions to the intelligentsia; publications and journalism; and mental institutions. Details in Vol. I, 167 ff. See also Shanahan, *op. cit.*, p. 301: "At a decisive moment German Protestantism had cast its lot with the authoritarian and the agrarian traditions of European life, openly scorning the urban-industrial and liberal world that was coming into being. German Protestantism thereby risked the loss of the common man's allegiance, for by committing itself to monarchical authority, it could not take the side of the people."

policy that led to the suppression of free action even by the Protestant churches whose interests had before been furthered by the Prussian state. Though there was considerable disagreement among the leaders as to the role of state legislation in social matters, it was a part of the Inner Mission's concern to influence society as a whole toward certain practical reforms, and many leaders favored legislative action. At this point Protestants were running into the same policies that the Roman Catholics had faced. It was a clear policy of Bismarck's leadership in the state that the church as an institution should keep to its place. The intent of the *Kulturkampf*, the battle of the Bismarckian state against the Roman Church, was, according to at least one leading scholar, to drive a wedge from the legislative side between rivals to state supremacy.[16]

Since the intent of the state was to suppress independent initiative by rival groups, the state also intended to be on top in dealing with social problems and the labor movement. This attitude was pointed up by the relationship between Bismarck, Chaplain (*Hofprediger*) Adolph Stoecker, and Kaiser Wilhelm II. Under the conviction that the church could only win the workers back from the Social Democrats by furthering their political demands, young Stoecker had been instrumental in founding a "Christian-Social Labor Party." Though the party never became a powerful force, Stoecker himself was always in the public eye. He wanted above all to keep the church alert and active in furthering the cause of the worker and retain its own freedom against the overbearing tactics of the state.[17] In the latter cause he hoped to appeal to the young Kaiser, reminding him that as the *summus episcopus* he had the duty to protect the interests of the church. Wilhelm was at first attracted by Stoecker's persuasive ability, but as time passed he came more and more under Bismarck's influence. Stoecker was released from his position as chaplain in 1890 but continued to be a leader in both church and politics. In 1895 the Evangelical superior church council (*Oberkirchenrat*) directed a warning to all pastors to desist from political activity. Stoecker and others (principally Friedrich Naumann) were henceforth confined to political activity.

16 Buchheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 211-213: "Es handelte sich um einen Kampf Bismarcks gegen die parlamentarischen Kräfte des Bürgertums. Denn diese Kräfte wurden durch die Ausnützung der konfessionellen Spaltung auf Jahrzehnte hinaus gelähmt."

17 *Ibid.*, pp. 239 ff.

Bismarck's antipathy for any such overt Christian activity as Stoecker proposed was accepted completely by the Kaiser, for an imperial message to a government official characterized the Christian-Social movement as "pure nonsense."[18]

The result of this suppression of the church was that most orthodox church groups had to retreat into their own area, to "care for the souls of their parishioners."[19] Actually most Protestants were in open sympathy with the successful policies of the government, and Bismarck judged rightly that loyalty to the state would overshadow the church loyalty of most nominal Protestants. The German nation's clamor for "a place in the sun" was shared by most churchmen, as one can see from the enthusiasm demonstrated by the churches for the war in 1914.[20]

## III. The Protestant Role in the Weimar Republic

In the shattering events of defeat and the breaking up of the Empire, many people in Germany lost all confidence in traditional values, including religious values. The church and the clergy even became convenient objects to blame for not having tried to prevent the holocaust by a moral protest against political and military abuses. Some quarters in the Communist and now dominant Social Democratic parties looked for the speedy end of the churches' influence in public life and the abolition of their privileges.[21]

The inevitable reaction to this criticism came from many sides. Apparently the trying experiences of wartime had created a somewhat closer relationship between clergy and laity, for laymen showed a sometimes surprising willingness to assume new responsibilities assigned to them by the new church constitutions. While there was much talk of

18 Means, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-35.

19 Shanahan, *op. cit.*, p. 369: "Bismarck's sudden change of front toward the liberals, and the swift surrender of the new government to their principles, which in many church circles stood for godlessness and iniquity, caused much dismay. . . . [His] course after 1867 left the orthodox church groups no alternative other than a retreat into political quietism and unobtrusive private charities." In a note Shanahan indicates that this is borne out by a study made by Gerhardt of the political comment in the *Westfaelischer Hausfreund*, a typical conservative Inner Mission newspaper. Theological appointments and religious instruction in the schools were about the only issues where the church continued to fight the inroads of liberalism.

20 Albrecht Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, *The War and German Society: The Testament of a Liberal* (New Haven, 1937), pp. 21-26.

21 The writer is indebted for most of the factual material in this and the following paragraphs to Means, *op. cit.*, pp. 80 ff.

stripping away all connections between church and state, even to the dropping of religious instruction in the schools, the church actually retained a good many privileges. The main changes came in the transfer of former state functions of church administration to an ecclesiastical senate, while in the provincial church bodies the synods were strengthened and given powers of self-government. State control over education within the church was surrendered and legally binding character was given to church decisions. For a small fee the machinery of government was used by the church to collect the church tax, a percentage of the income tax, paid by all who had not "resigned" their membership in one of the recognized churches (Catholic and Protestant). In most areas religious instruction was retained in the schools or recognition was given to the confessional schools. Inter-Mission-type social work grew in scope and prestige.

Perhaps the biggest readjustment which the Protestant churches had to make was in relation to the political atmosphere in the Weimar Republic. It has been shown above that most political interest by "church" Protestants was channeled into various conservative parties, whose greatest enemies were the Social Democrats. This situation naturally continued, but now the conservatives were actually in a position of opposing the legally constituted government. "At least eighty per cent of the pastors in the struggling years of the young republic were members of political parties to the right," either the *Deutsche Nationale Partei* or the more moderate *Deutsche Volkspartei* which favored a constitutional monarchy.[22] This demonstrates how little sympathy there was for a democratic form of government and how great the antipathy was between the conservative Protestant clergy and the parties to the left in the governing coalition. Those younger pastors who were interested in establishing rapport with the labor movement or who were sympathetic to the Socialist cause were usually disciplined by church authorities if they joined other parties. It is well known that the Social Democrats in Weimar lost much of their idealism and made vast compromises to remain in power. Under the economic chaos of the post-war period, the church itself became less critical of new solutions being sought by Socialism. So the antipathy lessened, and a number of pastors even joined the Religious-Socialist movement,

22 Means, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

though most retired into a neutral position from which they could criticize both capitalism and socialism.

There were a number of Christian-Social and similar elements that did want to make their peace with the Republic. In the south, in Württemberg, which had a stronger liberal tradition than that in the north, there arose what was later called the *Christliche Volksdienst* (Christian Service to the People). When remnants of the Stoecker party lost control of the *Deutsche Nationale Partei* to extreme nationalist and big industrialist factions, Mr. Mumm and several other leaders from this remnant entered into negotiation with the *Volksdienst* and agreed on general principles that would enable their groups to unite. The Swiss-born Tübingen theologian Adolph Schlatter was one of the leading theorists of the group, which preferred not to be called a "party" because of the unfortunate connotations of strife given to the term. This *Christlich-Soziale Volksdienst* picked up a few local posts in the first elections entered, in 1929, and in 1930 won 14 seats in the Reichstag elections that saw the National Socialists emerge as a major threat to the Republic. The *Volksdienst* representatives were part of the governing coalition, the first evangelical *Verfassungspartei* (constitutional party, committed to a democratic constitution).[23]

One of the factors that made the position of the governing coalition so shaky with the electorate was its ties to the Treaty of Versailles and relations with the Western powers. The Social Democrats had the impossible task of selling this treaty to the German people, implying of course that they accept sole guilt for the war. This was an extremely touchy issue for everyone, the doubtfulness of which has been demonstrated by scholars on both sides in the conflict. When German Protestants renewed their contacts with foreign churches after the War, principally in the ecumenical conferences at Stockholm and again in Oxford, this issue plagued them constantly. One may safely conclude that as a result of this war-guilt psychosis the Germans found it impossible to enter into the full spirit of the Ecumenical Movement and

23 Cf. Buchheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 385 ff. Buchheim shows the relevance of this group to the later building of an "überkonfessionelle Christliche Partei" after World War II. He speculates that if the *Volksdienst* had been able to have a slate in '28 that they would have received a much bigger vote in '30, for much of the vote of Christians went, for lack of any constructive party, to the Nazis, and by 1932 the people had been hypnotized by the success of the Nazis.

that a whole generation of churchmen was cut off from fellow Christians in other lands.[24]

It would be impossible to discover all the factors contributing to the disintegration of morale and confidence during the Weimar era. There was a psychological need for some force to develop a positive program for the rehabilitation of a sick nation. The church, too, was disgusted with the indifference or hostility to religious values on the part of the parties of the left and looked for a spiritual renewal of the *Volk*. The leader of the National Socialists, sensing the need for the support of the churches in his drive to full power, made statements promising just such a renewal. Hitler and his followers were calling for a "national and ethical renewal of the *Volk*," deliverance of the state from the haunting specter of Communism and Marxist Socialism, a rejection of the pagan, free-thinking movements, and the acceptance of a "positive Christianity" based upon the fighting faith of Luther, the first "national German theologian." Here, it seemed, was leadership that would bring about a restoration of order and give new vigor to all sides of national life, including religious life.[25]

It is a matter of history that the original reaction of the German Protestants to the Hitler regime was one of hopeful expectation. The appointment by the president of the Church Federation of a three-man Lutheran and Reformed committee to effect a united church constitution quickened the hopes that the long sought after church union would be realized. But hope was short-lived.

## IV. The Struggle of the Churches for Survival

The circumstances just described led a number of pastors and churchmen, even before the National Socialist advent to power, to join the ranks of that party or the ideologically related organization, the "Faith Movement of German Christians."[26] When Hitler gained

24 Chester L. Hunt, *The Relationship of National Socialism to the German Protestant Church*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Department of Sociology. 1948, pp. 48 ff.

25 *Ibid.*, pp. 85 ff.

26 At a conference of the movement in Berlin, June 6, 1932, the general lines for future effort were laid down: one united German church based on *"positives Christentum;"* an end of church parties; a crusade against Marxism; condemnation of the concordat with Rome; racial purity of the church and the suppression of Jewish influence; a rejection of pacifism and internationalism. All of these form a pattern that parallels in the church the objectives of the party for the state. Cf. Hunt, *op. cit.*, pp. 92, 93.

the chancellorship, a "German Christian" Ludwig Mueller was closely associated with Hitler and was his chief adviser on religious affairs. When the aforementioned church constitution, strengthening bonds within the Protestant churches, was passed, the "German Christians" were incensed that Mueller was not elected imperial bishop instead of the Inner Mission leader Friedrich von Bodelschwingh. Bodelschwingh resigned only a month after his election when several pastors were arrested and his office was by-passed in Prussia by the appointment of a government "state commissioner." Several weeks later, in the July church elections, the "German Christians" gained majorities in nearly all the provincial synods and Mueller was then elected imperial bishop.[27]

The only way in which the majority of pastors could show their dissent was to organize groups independent of the elected synods. Martin Niemöller, of Berlin-Dahlem, organized a "Pastors' Emergency League" of 6,000 members by September, 1933 (there were about 14,000 pastors in Germany).[28] These dissenting pastors, who were forced to by-pass the state-dominated church machinery and establish their own synods, became the nucleus of the so-called confessing church. Along with the "intact" churches in Bavaria, Hanover, and Württemberg, they formed a solid core of resistance to the totalitarian state.

It is significant to note that at the outset the resisting churchmen were not at odds with the state on general lines of domestic and foreign policy but by and large were aware only of the threats to ecclesiastical freedom inherent in the National Socialist program.[29] Early protests from theologians, church officials, and conferences dwelt mostly on opposition to the racial policies of the state and the attempts to "coordinate" church activities. They were based on a theological position that could not be relinquished, the spirit of which could be seen in this sentence from the declaration by the Confessing Church at its Barmen Synod in May, 1934: "Jesus Christ, as he is declared to us in Holy Scripture, is

27 *Ibid.*, pp. 97 ff. There were many irregularities in the election and incidents of intervention by the state, topped off by Hitler's own election-eve address urging a large vote for the "German Christians." The churches in Bavaria, Hanover, and Württemberg never came under German Christian control. These strong Lutheran churches held a more restrained attitude toward the government in the opening stages of the conflict than did the opposition groups in other areas.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 103. Means, *op. cit.*, pp. 239 ff. The latter puts the membership at 2,000, but only a few months later state officials arrested almost 200 pastors and warned about 5,000 others against the reading of a certain protest from the pulpits.

29 Cf. Karl Barth, *Theologische Existenz Heute* (Munich, 1934).

the one Word of God which . . . we must trust and obey. We repudiate the false teaching that the church can and must also recognize . . . other events and powers, figures and truths as divine revelation."[30] Starting from this strong premise that there is a higher power than the state which must be obeyed above all else, it was inevitable that the church would eventually have to repudiate the state and pray for its defeat.[31] This repudiation was by no means general because the Christian faith had long been undermined by secularism and cultural overtones, but its strength was no less real for being in the minority. The "German Christians" never became a large group—estimates of its greatest strength being from 1,500 to 2,000—and even the state turned its back on any official relationship with them. The imperial bishop Mueller became a forgotten man in church and state after his ineffectiveness became clear.

The result of the first years of the church struggle was that both sides realized the strength of the enemy and the impossibility of easy victory. In the long run it was not the Nazi state but the persecuted church that survived the conflict. Because the Protestant churches were among the most outspoken opponents of the Third Reich, they could rise from the ashes of ruin and defeat to accept new responsibilities.

## V. Rebuilding Shattered Foundations

"[The church] has become a power of the first rank in society and a partner in the political ordering of the nation, especially because it is

30 Martin, Newton, Waddams, and Williams, *Christian Counter Attack* (New York, 1944), pp. 33 ff. The complete documentation of the church struggle in Germany is presented in Heinrich Hermelink, *Kirche im Kampf. Dokumente des Widerstands und des Aufbaus der Evangelischen Kirche* (Tübingen und Stuttgart, 1950). The courage of these various statements can only be seen properly against the background of terror and suppression in the Third Reich. Many of the statements were circulated in the churches and sent directly to Hitler or to various ministries.

31 *Christian Counter Attack*, pp. 31 ff.: "Is the Protestant resistance in Germany worth talking about? The best answer is to point out that since 1934, 1,300 pastors have been arrested at one time or another. Many have been in concentration camps, a number have lost their lives, . . . the struggle of the Church in Norway was anticipated by the struggle of the Confessional Church." In the midst of war, the voices of dissent were still heard: Bishop Wurm of Württemberg made a number of courageous blasts at state policies, especially important being that during the Russian Campaign, when he said, "The Russians are told that Adolf Hitler and the German army have restored liberty of religion to the Russian people. . . . But among us the people are driven in the opposite direction and encouraged not to concern themselves about religious ceremonies. . . . Can such injustice and discord be endured? . . . How disillusioned are those who, relying on the promise of the party program, thought they could be both members of the party and active members of the church?"

the only legally constituted institution that survived the collapse and the partitioning of Germany."[32] This sentence from a German weekly newspaper summarizes clearly the new importance of the church in Germany since 1945. The casual observer would perhaps find it difficult to note any real change in the role of the Protestant churches, for the forms of activity have not been greatly altered; it might be said that it is rather a new spirit that permeates much of Protestant activity since the war.

It was pointed out above that after World War I the problem of war guilt was a factor in preventing the establishment of rapport between German and foreign churchmen. Following the defeat of Nazi Germany, the situation was almost completely reversed, for the church at home had suffered almost as much at the hands of Nazi leaders as had those against whom war had been waged. But the churchmen who had suffered the most were the first to insist that before God and their fellow Christians in other lands the German Protestants must confess their own solidarity with the nation in its guilt. These leaders knew that this would be the only way of facing Christians from the Allied nations.[33]

The importance of this confession of guilt by Protestant churchmen was this, that the way was not left open for writing off the twelve years of Hitler's reign as a "freak" occurrence. The many shortcomings in the church before 1933 were recognized. The necessity of a real shake-up in the churches' program, its relationship to society, and its responsibility in sharing the burden of reconstruction was seen. In other words, the church did not, as before 1933, look to its glorious past under the Kaiser but sought to rebuild the life of the church anew. Professor Schrey's article shows that the church in its struggle against totalitarianism had unconsciously assumed a radically new outlook, and that the church now stood in a positive relationship to "young democracy." The Stuttgart Declaration itself set the stage for Ger-

32 "Die Generation der Entscheidung," by Prof. Heinz Horst Schrey, in *Sonntagsblatt*, Oct. 30, 1955.

33 Cf. Stewart Herman, *The Rebirth of the German Church* (London, 1946), pp. 136 ff. The "German Christians" had been speedily removed from their offices, and most of the pastors belonging to the group were defrocked and humiliated. The new leaders of the provisional church government, who had all been leaders in the stand against the Nazis, presented a "formal declaration of responsibility and repentance which they presented to an official delegation of the World Council of Churches" in October, 1945, at Stuttgart. It was widely misunderstood in Germany as a result of inadequate explanation to the press.

man delegates to join the first post-war meeting of the World Council of Churches in Geneva less than a year after the cessation of hostilities. The work of the Council as well as of the Lutheran World Federation would be unthinkable without the contributions of the German theologians and churchmen.

It was not only pastors who were associated in the confessing church and in the resistance movement in the church. Laymen of many professions were also active in resisting Nazi pressures, and many of them were arrested for it.[34] The experience of worshiping together with men of all types and backgrounds forged the basis of a new relationship between pastors and laymen, and when their prison days were ended in 1945 or 1946, the laymen who had had such experiences were ready and willing to take up active leadership in the churches. Eugen Gerstenmaier, one of those arrested for participation in the plot of July 20, 1944, against Hitler, upon his release began a survey of the need for relief activities in cooperation with Bishop Wurm. By the time that the Evangelical Church in Germany was organized in the fall of 1945 the framework of a Protestant relief organization was already established. Gerstenmaier became the leader of *Evangelisches Hilfswerk,* which performed seemingly impossible tasks in collecting and distributing millions of marks' worth of food and clothing to homeless and devastated people. The fact that people gave when they had so little of their own indicates that the churches enjoyed tremendous prestige.

There is one point where all the new-found energies of the laity find their focus, and that is the Church Rally, a yearly event begun in 1950. The inspiring force behind the so-called *Kirchentag* movement is the layman Reinold von Thadden-Trieglaff, who developed many of the ideas he has put into practice since the war while he was a prisoner in a Russian camp in the Arctic circle, living in fellowship with many disillusioned National Socialists and soldiers of several countries. The question he began with was, "How can the church address itself to the world?"

> Only where the church meets the world at its frontier and declares its solidarity with the misery and sinfulness of the world, can the church fulfill its mission. By

34 There were active Christian laymen and pastors involved in the unsuccessful plot to overthrow Hitler on July 20, 1944. Cf. Gerhard Ritter, *Carl Goerdeler und die Deutsche Widerstandsbewegung* (Stuttgart, 1954), pp. 298, 474.

maintaining close proximity with the world, by rubbing elbows with man in his secularized environment, by emerging from pious seclusion, the church can address itself to the world. That is why the laity question is so enormously important: the layman represents the Christian message in the battlefield of the world, the pioneer on the outposts of the church, in the very frontier region where world and church collide. . . . There can be no living church without the living community of responsible laymen.[35]

The method chosen, after careful consideration by a committee of the laity meeting in Hanover shortly after the war, was to exploit the need for a feeling of community that would overcome all political and social barriers. Von Thadden had seen the efficacy of larger meetings in the "Evangelical Week" gatherings he had organized during the first years of the Hitler era for the purpose of strengthening the faith of those struggling to keep their freedom. Thus the *Kirchentag* was conceived of from its beginnings as a rally that would bring together German Protestants of all classes and of varying political beliefs in a public demonstration of the strength and meaning of the Christian faith in the modern world. Mass meetings, cultural presentations such as drama and poetry, Bible study and discussions, with participation by men and women of every class and profession, have been the strongest features.

What may be said of the church at large is especially true of the *Kirchentag,* that it "has striven from the very outset to function as a medium for unifying the population of a divided country."[36] The two rallies held in the east, in Berlin and Leipzig, have been especially important for their effect in uniting Christians in divided Germany. The church in the east zone, the so-called *Deutsche Demokratische Republik* (DDR), has since the war been fighting a battle for existence no less serious than in the Third Reich, whereas in the west economic and political recovery has raised the living standard. Therefore it is vitally important, say church leaders, that there be a free intercourse of ideas and a close fellowship in order to prevent a spiritual separation parallel

35 *Ecumenical Review,* October, 1951, p. 42 ff. The article is a report on the Berlin *Kirchentag* of 1951. Others were held in Essen, Hamburg, Stuttgart, and Leipzig. This writer attended the Leipzig meeting as one of about fifteen Americans granted visas to enter the Soviet zone.

36 *Germany Reports,* pub. by Press & Information Service of the Federal German Govt., 1955, p. 341: "The members of councils and synods consist of members of churches in the Federal Republic as well as in the Soviet Zone," being selected by numerical strength and holding meetings alternately in East and West Germany.

to the political division. On the two occasions mentioned, it was quite evident that the Iron Curtain had, for at least a few days, been rendered meaningless, for there was a unanimity and a oneness seldom found in any gathering. Speakers and discussion groups spoke freely regarding the political systems of both East and West, and thousands of young people risked the future by attending. At Leipzig 50,000 from the East and 10,000 from the West were registered. At the closing rally, it is estimated that 650,000 people were in attendance! A report by one observer, who stayed on after the Berlin *Kirchentag* to witness a Communist youth festival, points up the difference in attitude on the part of the youth at the two gatherings. The one was a real fellowship of individuals who had come because they wished to, while the other was clearly a mass demonstration pre-arranged by authorities and made up of coerced youngsters.[37] Despite the fact that East German youth have been victims of anti-Christian propaganda ever since 1933, there is considerable vitality and a vibrant faith shown by the strong minority who do participate at the risk of their lives and futures.

It was no accident that one working man from Leipzig stood up at the *Kirchentag* in that city and said to a speaker, "Dear Pastor, why don't you go into a factory near your home? You will find a different atmosphere, for there people talk about things and hard facts. . . . I have the feeling that you no longer quite understand the men who sit beneath your pulpit."[38] German theology has remained largely in the hands of university faculties where it is considered a science subject to scientific methodology. The stiff requirements have traditionally encouraged over-specialization and a consequent narrowness. When the theological faculties were gradually put under "German Christian" control after 1934, the confessing church had established a number of clandestine seminaries. Stewart Herman reports that almost a thousand pastors were trained in these unofficial seminaries before the Gestapo finally uncovered the last one. The church in Berlin established a *Kirch-*

37 *Ecumenical Review,* October, 1951, p. 83. The report stresses that the elementary urge for fellowship on a real human basis found such adequate outlet at Berlin. Since 1951 the DDR attitude toward the church has been sporadic and unpredictable. The general policy at present has been to avoid any overt conflicts but to continue suppression, especially of youth and student groups, on a more subtle level. In regard to youth, a substitute ceremony for confirmation, initiation into the "Free German Youth," has been introduced, but according to a report in *The Lutheran,* April 18, 1956, p. 9, these ceremonies were participated in by only five per cent of the eligible youth.

38 *Bericht der Leipziger Kirchentag* (Stuttgart, 1954), p. 158.

*liche Hochschule* (theological school) of its own without waiting for the re-opening of the university in the east sector; this was an effort to relate the student in his studies to the on-going work of the church. Elsewhere the programs of the post-university "practical seminaries" have been strengthened. A generation accustomed to hard realities demanded relevancy.

It would be dangerous to make generalizations, but it appears that there is a growing concern among theological professors as well as church leaders that theology should concern itself more with the problems of society at large. One significant step in this direction is a post-war institution known as the Evangelical Academies. These ". . . may be described briefly as retreat centers in which the attempt is made to establish a two-way conversation between the church and the world. . . . The success of the Academies was largely due to their conscious attempt to be 'neutral' meeting places where people could openly speak their minds and where the church would be willing to listen to them."[39] Starting with the first one in Hermannsburg, the idea has spread to nearly every part of Germany, and thousands of lay people from various callings have responded to the invitation of the Academies to participate in weekend or one-week retreats. They are not required to lay aside their differences in the discussions, but rather find the spirit conducive to airing their views.[40]

The staffs of the various Academies are responsible for keeping in touch with those who have participated and continuing discussions of problems that have emerged. The latter will sometimes give rise to a series of books or pamphlets on the subject at hand, e.g., religious instruction in the schools, rearmament, or ethics in business.[41] In an intellectual climate such as we find it in Germany, it can be seen how important a role these Academies might eventually come to play in bringing the church and the world in contact.

The whole area of church-state relationship and the role of the Christian in political life occupies a central place in theological dis-

39 *Frontiers,* April, 1956, p. 26.

40 *Germany Reports,* p. 345, where it is stated that in the first years at Hermannsburg, and later Loccum, a total of over 22,000 participants were recorded in Academy discussions. No figures are available to me on the total in all the Academies, but estimating it from this figure, more than 100,000 must have participated so far. Many of these people must "first find their way back to the church."

41 Helmut Thielecke, *Kirche und Oeffentlichkeit* (Tübingen, 1948).

cussion today. It is significant in itself that even conservative theologians like Künneth and Thielecke, whose works I have cited above, place their approach to the political ordering of life within the framework of liberal democracy as it is being unfolded in the Federal Republic. Both of them stress that Christians must participate in the day to day struggle to fashion a just and honorable government.[42] Merely saying this does not signify that a new course has been entered upon by Protestants; it is the supporting chorus of actions in the political realm itself that testifies to a transformation.

It is in the political reconstruction of the country that a new respect for the Protestant as well as the Roman Catholic churches can be noted. Shortly after taking office, Bavarian Minister President Wilhelm Hoegner made a surprising statement. Addressing a gathering of his Social Democratic Party, he stated:

> There is a further lesson which we Social Democrats should not toss to the winds. We have found by experience that social circumstances alone are not decisive in history. Much more, we have seen evil at work in the last twelve years, and we have seen also the working of moral forces which compelled our silent admiration. . . . We must take a positive position to religion. Churches which do not abase themselves as the slaves and bodyguards of the capitalist system are not our enemy. If they translate the teachings of Christianity into deeds, then they are the friends of all the poor and oppressed, and therefore the friends of the working class. . . . We Social Democrats have not forgotten that the Christian churches made considerable sacrifices in the struggle against National Socialism and often co-operated illegally with the workers' parties.[43]

If even the SPD has tried to make its peace with the Christian church, it can readily be seen that the orientation of the other main parties has moved in that direction. The Free Democratic Party, heir to the tradition of the so-called Liberal Party as it developed in the past century, has expressed indignation at certain aspersions cast by Christian Democrats to the effect that members of other parties may not claim to be Christian.[44] Thus it is fairly evident that the most important carriers

42 Cf. Thielecke, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-36. He criticizes the limitations of an Inner Mission approach to public life in that this only enables the church to perform the essentially feminine task of binding up wounds. Christianity also has the task of *preventing* the wounds of society; Christians should jump into the arena where the signals are being called and get in the game. Cf. also Künneth, *op. cit.*, pp. 470-472.

43 Cited in Stewart Herman, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

44 Richard Hammer, *Die FDP als Christliche Partei*, address delivered to an FDP convention. Mimeographed copy.

of political responsibility in the Federal Republic recognize the importance of allowing the church freedom and heeding its counsel.

The exigencies of wartime made "strange bedfellows" out of active Roman Catholics, Protestants, Socialists, Liberals, labor leaders, and capitalists. New understanding between the various groups was thus formed. Out of the experience of fighting together for existence against a common enemy has come a desire to cooperate, which in the case of Catholic and Protestant political figures has been of lasting significance. Recognizing that there are Protestant churchmen active in other parties, especially in the FDP, it must be noted that the Christian Democratic Union is the product of a conscious "desire on the part of both Protestants and Catholics to develop a democratic and social party founded on Christian principles."[45] The framework was provided in some Catholic sections by the old Center Party, in Bavaria by the People's Party (the party in Bavaria goes by the name Christian Socialist Union and retains its independence from the CDU at large), and in some Protestant sections by such groups as the *Christliche-Soziale Volksdienst* and the German Nationalists. Thus is brought together the Catholic labor left and various fractions of the right, a factor which has discouraged policies leaning to either extreme.[46]

Though there was considerable hesitation among Protestants who had not shared in any wartime cooperative effort to accept the principle that Catholics and Protestants could and should join hands in working for a democratic form of government, there was a good sprinkling of church leaders who started the move in that direction. Pastor Hermann Lutze lectured in Wuppertal on the need for a new interest and outlook by Protestants in the political world. Bishop Otto Dibelius, reared in the Prussian conservatism of the monarchy, was one of the first to urge a watchful Protestant support of the CDU. The late Bishop Marahrens, of Hanover, helped to overcome the timidity of Protestants in his territory by giving public support to the CDU. The first chairman in Lower Saxony was the church leader *Oberkirchenrat* Adolf Cillien. One of the most influential leaders in Germany since 1945 was the late *Oberkirchenrat* Hermann Ehlers, called by many the "crown prince" of the CDU. As president of the *Bundestag* (Senate) and sec-

45 Herman, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

46 Cf. Buchheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 409 ff. Cf. also Ludwig Bergstraesser, *Geschichte der Politischen Parteien in Deutschland* (Munich, 1952).

ond only to Adenauer himself in the CDU, he was uncompromising in his efforts to keep the party aware of its responsibility as a Christian party. He maintained his activity as a church leader while in office. On his death he was succeeded by the former head of the Protestant relief agency, Eugen Gerstenmaier. These men have had cordial relations with both confessions, a factor to be observed carefully in leadership choices.

Pastor Niemoeller and Dr. Eduard Heinemann have since 1951 been publicly critical of the foreign policy of the Adenauer-CDU government. As churchmen interested in preserving the unity of the church and the reunification of the country, they maintain that Germany must follow a neutral course. A pamphlet issued by the CDU Protestant working-group headed by Ehlers asserted that these churchmen were naively allowing themselves to become tools of Soviet policy. This issue is perhaps the most controversial one facing any German government. The church officially refuses to take sides on matters of reunification and rearmament, preferring to exercise an unfettered voice of conscience that will point up the moral and human factors. The continued private support by many Protestant leaders of a Western-oriented, anti-Soviet foreign policy can be seen in many books and periodicals of the church. Clear in any case is the trend away from the earlier quietism.

# Patriotic Activity of Calvinistic and Lutheran Clergymen During the American Revolution

By Dagobert de Levie

THE WRITER of a letter printed anonymously in the *Rivington's Gazette* of March 9, 1775, was, to say the least, undoubtedly guilty of oversimplifying matters when he stated that the proponents of political independence from England consisted of but two sorts of men—impoverished debauchees and clerics. "The latter are the ministers of the gospel, who, instead of preaching to their flocks meekness, sobriety, attention to their different employments, and a steady obedience to the laws of Britain, belch from the pulpit liberty, independence, and a steady perseverance in endeavoring to shake off their allegiance to the mother country. The independent ministers have ever been, since the first settling of this colony, the instigators and abettors of every persecution and conspiracy."[1] Although utterly worthless as historical evidence, yet when supported by other, less impassioned eyewitness reports,[2] this comment on the colonial clergy, biased and distorted as it is, gives us some idea of the general orientation and the political activity of the majority of American clergymen during the Revolution. Since the studies of Cross[3] and Van Tyne[4] on the American Revolution, the re-

1 Frank Moore, *Diary of the American Revolution* (New York, 1860), I, pp. 43-44.

2 Thomas Gage, "A Proclamation given at Boston 12 June 1775," *The Remembrancer*, 1775, p. 127: ". . . the name of God has been introduced in the pulpits to excite and justify devastation and massacre." Also, *Familiar Letters of John Adams* (Boston and New York, 1875). From a letter written 11 June 1775: "I hope you have received a letter, in which I inclosed you a pastoral letter from the synod of New York and Philadelphia; by this you will see, that the clergy this way are but now beginning to engage in politics, and they engage with a fervor that will produce wonderful effects." From a letter written 7 July 1775: "Tell him (i.e. Mr. Wibird) the clergy here of every denomination, not excepting the Episcopalian, thunder and lighten every Sabbath. They pray for Boston and Massachusetts. They thank God most explicitly and fervently for our remarkable successes. They pray for the American army. They seem to feel as if they were among you."

3 A. L. Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies* (New York, 1902).

4 C. Van Tyne, *The Loyalists in the American Revolution* (New York, 1902); *The Causes of the War of Independence* (New York, 1922); "Influence of the Clergy and of Religious and Sectarian Forces on the American Revolution," *American Historical Review*, XIX (1913-14), 44-46.

ligious factor and the important rôle played by the clerical office have been sufficiently recognized,[5] and today there exists little doubt that "religious affairs were closely involved in the political questions of the time."[6] It is still undetermined, however, whether or to what extent doctrinal tenets and ecclesiastical traditions exercised a restraining influence on the clergymen's political activity.

This paper is meant to be a contribution to the study of the historic attitude toward Christian participation in war and politics, in particular of the degree of patriotic activity of the exponents of religion, the clergy, during the War of Independence. The crusading quality of the Revolutionary War and its effect on the war effort of the Calvinistic clergy have already been recognized.[7] Less firmly established is the function, in this war, of the non-Calvinistic clergy. The attitude of the Lutheran ministers, for example, is open to question and is specially liable to be misunderstood.

It is the purpose of this study to show how Calvinistic and Lutheran preachers responded to the problem of simultaneously preserving the spirituality of their office and meeting the challenge of war. We shall examine how representative Calvinistic or Calvinist-influenced and Lutheran theologians felt about the clergy's involvement in politico-secular activities, and about political sermons in particular. The very existence of the political sermons mentioned in the following pages perhaps indicates the specific standpoint of the religious group from which they originated. That in these sermons the preachers expressed an ever-present awareness of the basic incompatibility of clerical office and political activity is of itself incontestable evidence that the problem which we are studying was at the time a very real one.

## I

In several of his thirteen sermons preached between the years 1763 and 1775 and reprinted in London in 1797 as *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution,* the Anglican Tory clergy-

5 A. M. Baldwin, *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution* (Durham, N. C., 1928); E. F. Humphrey, *Nationalism and Religion in America* (Boston, 1924); W. W. Sweet, *The Story of Religions in America* (New York, 1930).

6 A. L. Cross, *op. cit.*, pp. 271-272.

7 R. H. Bainton, "The Churches and War: Historic Attitudes Toward Christian Participation," *Social Action,* Jan. 15, 1945. See also A. M. Baldwin, *op. cit.*

man Jonathan Boucher presented his views on the duties and functions of the clerical office. Mindful of his spiritual duties and of the limitations set on the clergy in their professional activities, Boucher preached "On Reducing the Revenue of the Clergy," but he let it be known beforehand that in so doing he kept within his "immediate province as a preacher of the word of God."[8] If, tempted by the opportunity, he also ventured to make a few observations regarding civil officers, he asked that his digression be pardoned. Concerning "essential interests," he later declared,[9] the ministers of religion should remember that it was as much their duty to enlighten men's understanding as it was to improve their morals. In his sermon "On Civil Liberty, Passive Obedience, and Non-Resistance," we find more than casual reference to the political sermon. Boucher revealed that at that time the political sermon was indeed highly controversial and that he himself had actually been reproached for having preached politics from his pulpit. To obviate the charges, he declared that preaching politics was not yet proscribed from the pulpits and that he was not singular in continuing this practice. Politics properly understood formed an essential branch of Christian duty, in so far as politics constituted a principal part, if not the whole, of the second table of the Decalogue. Honoring and obeying the king, and all those who were put in authority under him, was in full accordance with St. Paul's teachings. "This, however, is as direct and clear a commission for a Christian minister's preaching on politics, in the just sense of the word, on all proper occasions, as can be produced for our preaching at all on any subject."[10] Boucher's viewpoint on the preaching of politics is clarified in a footnote in the sermon collection of 1797. The pulpit should be kept aloof from narrow, selfish, and servile party politics; on the other hand, to exhort one's audience to be good subjects and neighbors did not constitute a confusion of duties. "The peremptory tone with which we of the Clergy are so often interdicted from meddling with politics in our pulpits, has long appeared to me to be more dictatorial than, as the free subjects of a free govern-

8 Jonathan Boucher, *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution* (London, 1797), p. 215 (from Discourse V: On Reducing the Revenue of the Clergy, preached 1771).

9 *Ibid.*, p. 451 (from Discourse XI: The Dispute between the Israelites and the Two Tribes and an Half, Respecting their Settlement beyond Jordan, preached 1775).

10 *Ibid.*, pp. 496-501 (from Discourse XII: On Civil Liberty, Passive Obedience, and Non-Resistance, preached 1775).

ment, it is incumbent on us to bear. We surely are not less at liberty than other men to use our own discretion."[11] Finally, in his "Farewell Sermon" of 1775, Boucher entreated his audience to judge whether his sermons really contained any doctrines unworthy of a Christian minister to teach, "as has been asserted by those rude men who, with little respect to decorum and good manners, as to religion and piety, occasioned the uproar last Thursday."[12]

In actual doctrine there was little difference between the Church of England and the Methodist movement. As to the relationship of church and state, both recognized the Erastian doctrine of the spiritual as well as temporal supremacy of the sovereign, the "supreme governor" of the church since the Act of Supremacy in 1559. Accordingly, the state was blended with the church into one organic whole, symbolized by the person of the king as head of both. Hence follows the keen sensitiveness on the part of the Anglican clergy to crimes committed against the sovereign or offenses violating the dignity of the royal authority. Thus Jonathan Boucher urged obedience to the king. John Wesley likewise took the side of royal authority in his short (though for our study significant) tract, "How far it is the Duty of a Christian Minister to preach politics." In this, Wesley repeatedly stressed the spiritual nature of the duties of a Christian minister, whose constant and main task was preaching "repentence towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ."[13] His defense of the king rested on Acts 23:5, which prohibited man from speaking evil of his ruler. If refuting unjust censures and slanders against the king meant talking politics, Wesley would insist that the minister go ahead and preach politics, provided he did it infrequently and only when occasion warranted. His suggestion that ministers should not judge the measures of statesmen was practical rather than theological: "It behooves us to be silent, as we may suppose they know their own business best." In what measure John Wesley's viewpoint, with its emphasis on the sacredness of the ruling authority, actually gave free scope to the cleric's political activity, is best evidenced by his *Calm Address to our American Colonies* (1775).

11 *Ibid.*, p. 499. This was Boucher's reply to Edmund Burke who in his *Reflection on the Revolution in France* (London 1790), p. 14, had denounced the political sermon on the grounds that politics and pulpit were terms that had little agreement, and that neither the cause of civil liberty and civil government nor that of religion would gain by a confusion of clerical duties.

12 *Ibid.*, pp. 562-563 (from Discourse XIII: A Farewell Sermon, preached 1775).

13 *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley* (New York, 1827), X, p. 137.

"It has never been my practice, for reasons which appear to me to be good, to intermix politics with the ordinary service of the sanctuary . . . ,"[14] declared John Witherspoon, the most noteworthy representative of the Revolutionary Presbyterians and the only minister of religion to sign the Declaration of Independence, at a public thanksgiving after the war. As a rule, the clergyman's proper business was to engage in matters spiritual, but on extraordinary occasions, Witherspoon held, it should become part of a minister's duty to direct the attention of his hearers to events of a public (i.e. political) nature. Thus, at the very outset of hostilities, in his now famous sermon on "The Dominion of Providence over the Passions of Men," preached at Princeton on May 17, 1776, he solemnly asserted that never before had he introduced any political subject into the pulpit. Yet the greatness of the hour made such action not only lawful, but necessary, and willingly and without hesitation he now embraced the opportunity of attesting to the justice of the cause for which America was in arms.[15]

That the question whether preachers were permitted to engage in politics was indeed very much alive, and of grave concern even to the most eminent theologians, is further shown by several observations of the New England Congregationalist Jonathan Mayhew. To him the matter was so important that he discussed it in detail at least three times. In his epoch-making "Discourse concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers" he justified preaching politics, both in his prefatory note and in his introduction. Later, in his historic "Repeal of the Stamp Act," he again defended the political rôle of the clerical office.

Though acknowledging the importance and spirituality of the kingdom of Christ, Jonathan Mayhew rejected the implication that with John 18:36 the clergy's political indifference toward the affairs of civil government was established.[16] To censure a Christian minister for meddling in politics was equivalent to rebuking the inspired apostles who in their epistles to the Christian churches had written about political matters. Hence it followed, Mayhew argued, that it was proper for all

14 *The Works of John Witherspoon* (Edinburgh, 1804), V, p. 238 (Sermon XXIII).

15 John Witherspoon, *The Dominion of Providence over the Passions of Men. A Sermon preached at Princeton, on the 17th of May, 1776*, pp. 39-41.

16 Jonathan Mayhew, *A Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers* (1750), in J. W. Thornton, *The Pulpit of the American Revolution: or the Political Sermons of the Period of 1776* (Boston, 1860), pp. 53-54.

who acknowledged the authority of Jesus and the inspiration of the apostles to endeavor to understand what their doctrine concerning this matter really was. Besides, according to II Peter 3:16, all Scripture was profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness. Why, asked Mayhew, should not those parts of Scripture relating to civil government be explained from the pulpit? Obedience to the civil magistrate being a Christian duty, its nature, grounds, and extent should be considered in a Christian assembly.[17] The affairs of civil government undoubtedly came under the domain of the religious authority, and conversely the religious teachings concerning the nature and design of the political office should be of concern to Christian magistrates and all Christian subjects.

To Jonathan Mayhew, as to most New England ministers, the law of God concerned political as well as religious and ecclesiastical matters. In their sermons and writings the New England clergy of the eighteenth century elaborated upon political theory and displayed a vital interest in the concepts of government and the principles that should guide rulers and magistrates. It was in this broader sense of the term that Mayhew wanted to discuss "politics." As he specifically stated, politics were matter for religious consideration in so far as they related "to the general nature and end of magistracy."[18] He wanted to lay down "some general principles concerning the office of civil rulers" and to define "the nature and design" of civil government. Yet he would not go so far as to preach "very particularly" on the repeal of the stamp act, partly from a conviction of "the impropriety of minutely discussing points of this nature in the pulpit."[19] He made it clear that only "by waiving political controversy" did he see his way to deliver the sermon.

Going a step beyond Mayhew, at least in principle, William Gordon, the New England Congregational minister of Roxbury and author of *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Establishment of the Independence of the United States of America*, would exclude from the preacher's repertory, in normal times, even such sermons as dealt with political theory, as for instance the fate of kingdoms or the civil rights of human nature. However, he preached so vehemently and in such vigorous lan-

17 *Ibid*, p. 47.

18 *Ibid.*, p. 53.

19 Jonathan Mayhew, *On Repeal of the Stamp Act* (1766), in Frank Moore, *The Patriot Preachers of the American Revolution* (New York, 1860), pp. 10-11.

guage against England that his sermon of Dec. 15, 1774, aroused great indignation and called forth a condemnation of "the reverend politician," "clerical disclaimer," and "warfaring priest." "I most heartily wish, for the peace of America," commented his critic, "that he and many others of his profession would confine themselves to gospel truth."[20] In this controversial sermon Gordon had maintained that there were special times and seasons when the pulpit was permitted to treat politics, and that it was no transgression to preach on political doctrines when other ministers were delivering sermons on the doctrines of non-resistance and passive obedience.[21]

Suffice it to point out briefly that opposition to political sermons was voiced not exclusively by people who insisted on the absolute spirituality of the clerical office. A number of critics took offense, less because some clergymen preached on politics than because they preached unpopular politics.[22] Others objected to the political sermon because to them the word "politics" had become a mere euphemism for Toryism.[23] To Samuel Stillman of Boston, a noted Baptist preacher who himself had sermonized on the repeal of the stamp act, on the character of a good soldier, and on the duty of magistrates, is attributed the saying, "The complaint against ministers was, not that they preached at times on politics, but that they did not preach the right politics."[24]

American clergymen, in so far as they took sides during the Revolution, were fully cognizant of their peculiar rôle and of the spiritual domain as their primary concern, and at times they admitted that preaching politics was not the proper function of the clerical office. Some refused on principle to intermix politics with their purely clerical duties, yet they did not consider it a transgression of the clerical function to engage in politics on extraordinary occasions. Others regarded political theory and the broader concepts of government and state as an essential branch of Christian teaching and consequently discussed the current political controversy in their sermons and writings.

Calvinistic and Baptist doctrines molded the basic convictions of

20 J. W. Thornton, *The Pulpit of the American Revolution: or the Political Sermons of the Period of 1776* (Boston, 1860), p. 196.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 197 (Discourse preached Dec. 15, 1774).

22 Jonathan Boucher, *op. cit.*, pp. 496-501 (Discourse XII).

23 Charles F. Mullett, "Tory Imperialism on the Eve of the Declaration of Independence," *The Canadian Historical Review*, XII (1931), pp. 262-282.

24 W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit* (New York, 1865), VI, pp. 77-78.

the largest religious groups in the colonies: the Congregationalists of New England, the Presbyterians and Reformed in the middle states, and the Baptists. To some extent even the Anglicans of the South were influenced by the views of John Calvin. We are here concerned with the effect of Calvinism upon fundamental political thought in the colonies and specifically with its effect upon the relation of the American clergy to political life.

Calvin's teachings on the nature of civil government and on the relation of state and church, especially his views on the two kinds of government, the spiritual and the secular, show great similarity to Martin Luther's fundamental concept of authority and of the two kingdoms, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world. Like the German Reformer, Calvin recognized the independent and secular function of the state and made a sharp distinction between the character and functions of state and church.[25]

Yet although Calvin in his teachings on government used almost the same language as Luther, who before him had insisted on strict separation of the religious and the secular authority, in practice he merged the religious and temporal spheres and made the state subordinate to the church in his Genevan theocracy. According to Ernst Troeltsch,[26] primitive Calvinism was influenced by the general cultural situation in Geneva. Here alone, where a young government without traditions was facing a complicated situation, could Calvin hope to realize his ideal of a holy community. Only after the church had become the backbone of the small and immature state whose political independence was bound up with the maintenance of the Reformation, was Calvin able to create a holy community which directed its own affairs in accordance with the Word of God and was kept pure through the exercise of discipline. This development would have been impossible without the organized rule of Christian thought over society, which unavoidably led to the establishment of theocracy. Henceforth, the church was no longer merely an organ of salvation, but became an effective means of Christianizing the community in that the whole range of life was placed under Christian regulation and purpose.

25 John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Philadelphia, s.a.), II, p. 771 (On Civil Government).

26 Cf. E. Troeltsch, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches* (London and New York, 1950), II, pp. 625-628.

With the rise of the "free church" system and its emphasis on the separation of church and state, Calvinism in its historical evolution reversed its earlier trend and came to reject the whole state-church system and the tying together of church and state affairs. Wherever Calvinism with its theocratic tendencies encountered the resistance of powerful civil authorities, it was forced into a new position, into adopting the voluntary church which the state could not touch.[27] As minority churches, determined to assert themselves over against the power of the state and its established church, the free churches promoted the principle of complete separation between church and state. However, in their endeavor to create a "pure" church, to attain the separation of the spiritual and the temporal spheres, and to secure civil and religious liberties, the Calvinistic free churches as well as the Baptist, in spite of their fundamental detachment from the external affairs of the state, became involved in the great political controversies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and contributed political concepts and theories which profoundly influenced the political thinking of the time.

As a result of its associations with theocratic government and of the continuous entanglement of the free churches in religio-political struggles, Calvinism remained in contact with mundane affairs and produced a system of political thinking which is characterized by a strong religious element.

To Calvinistic tradition can be traced the legalism of theology and church polity, as well as the belief in the inviolability of religious and civil covenants, which Alice M. Baldwin viewed as the foundations of the elaborate theory of government developed by the New England clergy before 1763. The principles of the sovereignty of the people, of the right of resistance against the "tyrant" and of revolution, of the legal obligation of the ruler and the binding character of a constitution —all those principles that furnished leaven and stimulus during the political uprisings in the colonies—found support in Calvin, Beza, the Monarchomachi literature, John Knox, and later Calvinists.

In her well-documented study of the relation of the New England minister to the thought and life of eighteenth century New England, Alice M. Baldwin laid great stress on the analogy between theology

27 Cf. *ibid.*, II, pp. 656-661.

and political theory in Puritan New England and on the interpenetration of religious and political thinking. The arguments used against England were, in her opinion, not new but had grown "out of theology and church polity, out of sharp ecclesiastical controversy as well as of more purely political theory."[28] No class had been more concerned with political theories before 1763 than the clergy, who "preached of the fixed constitution of God, of the Bible, as establishing and illustrating great principles of civil government, of the natural and Christian rights of men which were given by God."[29] To the legal-minded New England Puritans "the law of God did not concern religious and ecclesiastical matters alone, but affected politics as well."[30]

Apart from the religious implications inherent in such an attitude of mind, practical considerations also made the ministers' concern in political issues imperative. It was clearly recognized that the welfare of church and state were mutually dependent and that civil and religious rights were related. This relation was expressed in the stereotyped formula "civil and religious liberties" or "civil and religious rights," which was no mere rhetorical pleonasm but an ever-recurring motto that revealed the intrinsic bipolarity of the Revolutionary endeavor. Thus is explained the propensity of the clergy to take a far advanced position in the great political controversy and to inculcate in the minds of their flocks the ideas that civil liberty and religious liberty were inextricably connected and that religious rights could not be preserved if civil liberty were lost. "There is not a single instance in history in which civil liberty was lost, and religious liberty preserved entire," John Witherspoon solemnly declared in his historic sermon at Princeton, which ended with the plea "that in America true religion and civil liberty may be inseparable, and that the unjust attempts to destroy the one may in the issue tend to the support and establishment of both."[31] Still hoping for a happy reconciliation between the colonies and the mother country, President Samuel Langdon of Harvard in 1775 looked forward to better relations between the sovereign and the colonists, "with perfect security of all their natural rights, and civil and religious liberties."[32] The Episcopalian William Smith, provost of

28 A. M. Baldwin, *op. cit.*, p. 168.
29 *Ibid.*, p. 127.
30 *Ibid.*, p. 13.
31 John Witherspoon, *op. cit.*, p. 60.
32 Frank Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 64 (Samuel Langdon: Government Corrupted by Vice).

the College of Philadelphia, although opposing independence from England, repeatedly revealed a patriotic concern for American rights. In his sermon "On the Crisis of American Affairs" (1775) he rejected separation from the mother country, yet knowing "that our civil and religious rights are linked together in one indissoluble bond," he exhorted his listeners that "religion and liberty must flourish or fall together in America."[33] True religion, virtue, and liberty were more nearly related and more intimately connected with one another than people commonly considered,[34] thought William Gordon, who bemoaned the attacks made upon the foundations of the country's civil government, "which, if successful, will in all probability, after a time, undermine and destroy its religious liberties. . . ."[35] For Samuel Stillman the political struggle involved "the perpetual enjoyment of civil and religious liberty."[36] He was thus in full accord with a resolution made earlier by the Baptists of Suffolk County, that "this county, confiding in the wisdom and integrity of the Continental Congress, now sitting in Philadelphia, will pay all due respect and submission to such measures as may be recommended by them to the Colonies, for the restoration and establishment of our just rights, civil and religious."[37] In an address to their brethren of Boston, the ministers of Connecticut maintained that "the taking away of civil liberty will involve the ruin of religious liberty also,"[38] and Charles Turner, who had conceded that ministers should not meddle in local politics, asserted that it was their duty to interfere when the liberties of the land were assailed, "for religious liberty is so blended with civil, that if one fails it is not to be expected that the other will continue."[39] Finally, among the purposes given by the Massachusetts legislature for the convening of the first Continental Congress was the necessity of devising measures "for the recovery and establishment of their just rights and liberties, civil and religious."[40]

Ample opportunity to stimulate among their flocks an interest in

33 *Ibid.*, p. 105.
34 *Ibid.*, p. 167 (William Gordon: Separation of the Jewish Tribes, 1777).
35 J. W. Thornton, *op. cit.*, p. 214 (William Langdon: Discourse preached Dec. 15, 1774).
36 Frank Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 275 (Samuel Stillman: The Duty of Magistrates, 1779).
37 Isaac Backus, *A Church History of New England* (Boston, 1784), II, p. 302.
38 J. T. Headley, *The Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution* (New York, 1864), p. 59.
39 *Ibid.*, p. 27.
40 A. P. Stokes, *Church and State in the United States* (New York, 1950), I, p. 258.

political theory and an understanding of political issues was found by the Puritan ministers in the so-called election and artillery sermons. Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Plymouth had their annual election sermon when they chose their councils for the ensuing year, and Massachusetts had her military counterpart, the annual artillery sermon when, on artillery election day, new officers were selected or chosen. On these occasions, when the preacher was elected alternately by the Council and the House of Assembly, political subjects were deemed very proper. For generations New England Puritans had heard political topics discussed from the pulpit, and when with the increasing gravity of the political situation their clergymen used the church for the dissemination of political doctrine, they hardly saw anything reprehensible in it.

## II

The glorious contributions made to the common patriotic endeavor by the Lutheran segment of the population hardly call for further documentation. Like the rest of the nation, many Lutherans supported the cause of political independence, and Lutherans held high positions in the Continental army and in government. In contrast to their Calvinistic colleagues, however, the Lutheran ministers, on the whole, appear to have been exceedingly careful not to identify themselves with political party views and accordingly played a far less conspicuous part in the great political struggle.

Lutheran sermons of the Revolutionary era are almost nonexistent. Of the very few that did find their way out of the minister's outline-book to the printing press, practically none can be considered a political or patriotic sermon. Only the *Aufforderung an das Volk Gottes in Amerika zum frohen Jauchzen und Danken,* preached in 1783 by John Christopher Kunze, faintly resembles the political sermons of Calvinistic clergymen. Yet even this rare specimen of a Lutheran political sermon is an expression of thanksgiving for the victory won, not an incitement to political action and war. Kunze was jubilant about the end of hostilities; he found special satisfaction in the fact that the Americans had fought a defensive war and that the cause of the war was a desire for independence from a foreign power. Compared with the countless non-Lutheran political sermons, this one lacks politico-

theoretical arguments. It says little about natural law and constitutions, and there is a significant silence about the inviolability of covenants, the sovereignty of the people, the right of resistance and of revolution. Nor does its author impress us as a trained political controversialist or as well-versed in political theory. On the contrary: "A preacher . . . can find too many topics in the Lord's Gospel on which he is called upon to preach, to spend his time recalling recent worldly affairs."[41] Prior to the war Kunze had expressed the hope that the king would grant the colonies the liberties they had formerly enjoyed, but avoided further discussion of his own political sentiments, declaring that he gladly left political judgments to others. "My real judgment about it is theological."[42] The *Aufforderung* breathes a spirit of peace on earth. Kunze himself took special pride (in bold type!) that, being by calling a proclaimer of spiritual peace, he was destined to become a herald of the peace of his country.

Unlike Jonathan Mayhew's fiery, politically charged sermon on the Repeal of the Stamp Act, the sermon which Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, founder and patriarch of American Lutheranism, preached on the same occasion[43] is wanting in the current political arguments and, moreover, lacks the customary references to Calvin, Locke, Pufendorff, Milton, and Voltaire. Instead it is filled with pious Bible verses and sayings of Luther. Muhlenberg had nothing to say about the political disabilities of the colonies. On the contrary, he had only praise for the freedom of conscience and the civil liberty then existing, for the best constitution, and for the beautiful laws of the land. Apparently of greater concern to Muhlenberg than political issues was the moral corruption of his time, which, as he saw it, found its expression in frequent brawling, murder, unchastity, fornication, adultery, and robbery. The yielding disposition of King George III, Muhlenberg thought, was evidence of God's kindness toward his people, for whose chastisement

41 J. C. Kunze, *Eine Aufforderung an das Volk Gottes in Amerika zum frohen Jauchzen und Danken, nebst dem Anhange einer andern Predigt ähnlichen Inhalts* (Philadelphia, 1784), p. 33.

42 T. G. Tappert, "Henry Melchior Muhlenberg and the American Revolution," *Church History*, XI (1942), p. 6.

43 H. M. Muhlenberg, *Ein Zeugnis von der Güte und Ernst Gottes gegen sein Bundesvolk in alten und neuern Zeiten, Und des Volks Undankbarkeit gegen Gott, den höchsten Wohlthäter* (Philadelphia, 1766).

God had put the rod of correction (*Zuchtruthe*) into the hand of their most gracious ruler (*Landesvater*).

Several Lutheran ministers, it is true, were in wholehearted sympathy with the American cause, and on occasion they stated their views freely. John Frederick Schmidt, a zealous Whig, was compelled to flee when Germantown was occupied by the British. So effectively did John Nicholas Martin, minister of the congregation in Charleston, arouse the patriotic feelings of his members that they formed a German Fusilier Company, and the British, being informed of his activities, ultimately closed his church. John Nicholas Kurtz, "after preaching an appropriate sermon," invited his hearers to collect clothes for the destitute and suffering patriot soldiers. At least two Lutheran clergymen, Christian Streit and Henry Moeller (or Mueller), served as chaplains during the war. The former, attached to the Third Virginia Regiment, was the first Lutheran chaplain in the American army.[44]

Moreover, no account of the patriotism of Lutheran ministers, however cursory and unpretending to completeness, could possibly ignore the brilliant and meritorious services rendered the American cause by the Muhlenberg family. As a matter of fact, so glorious was the military career of John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg that he went down in history as the fighting parson of the American Revolution. According to tradition his farewell message to his congregation in January, 1776, contained the now famous words: "In the language of Holy Writ, there is a time for all things. There is a time to preach and a time to fight; and now is the time to fight." After the benediction, it is reported, he threw off his vestment and stood before his congregation in the uniform of a Virginia colonel.

Yet this gesture also has its symbolic significance, for never did the fighting parson find his way back to the pulpit or again don the minister's gown. After his military career (brigadier-general in 1777 and major-general in 1783) he became a politician and a statesman. He was a member of the Virginia Convention of 1776, and later represented Pennsylvania both in the House and in the Senate of the United States. Like his brother Frederick Augustus Conrad Muhlenberg, an ordained Lutheran minister who in 1779 became a member of the Continental Congress and thereafter never returned to his clerical

44 Cf. W. B. Sprague, *op. cit.*, vol. IX.

office, Peter sacrificed the interests of the church to the political issues of his time.[45]

It has been said that had Peter's wishes alone been consulted in the selection of his future profession, he would undoubtedly have chosen the army from the beginning.[46] He yielded to the wishes of his father, Henry Melchior, who hoped that his sons would support and sustain his own lifework. Despite his father's warnings Peter Muhlenberg joined the Church of England.[47] After subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and the three articles of the Thirty-six Canons at the King's Chapel of St. James in London in 1772, Peter was ordained an Anglican priest. For this reason Bishop Perry, in his *Influence of the Clergy in the War of the Revolution,* claimed "that noble patriot of Lutheran training and German descent" for the Episcopal Church.[48]

There is not a word of comment in the Journals[49] of the elder Muhlenberg regarding the political action of his sons, although it caused him so much distress.[50] All the more expressive, therefore, is his terse entry on October 7, 1776: "Last night I was much troubled about Peter in a dream." Equally factual, without the faintest sign of patriotic enthusiasm or personal satisfaction, is his entry of July 2, which merely states, "The Continental Congress resolved to declare the thirteen colonies free and independent." On July 4, after recording that "today the Continental Congress openly declared the united provinces of North America to be free and independent states," he added, "This has caused some thoughtful and far-seeing *melancholici* to be down in the mouth; on the other hand, it has caused some sanguine *miopes* to exult and shout with joy. *In fine videbitur cuius toni.*"

In his Journals Henry Melchior Muhlenberg is a neutral observer

45 See also T. G. Tappert, *op. cit.,* p. 11-12. Dr. Tappert brought to light a very relevant exchange of letters between John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg and his brother Frederick August regarding the true function of the clerical office.

46 H. A. Muhlenberg, *The Life of Major-General Peter Muhlenberg of the Revolutionary Army* (Philadelphia, 1849), p. 31.

47 Cf. W. J. Mann, *Life and Times of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg* (Philadelphia, 1887), p. 429. E. W. Hocker, *The Fighting Parson of the American Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1936), p. 43. H. A. Muhlenberg, *op. cit.,* p. 36.

48 W. S. Perry, *The Influence of the Clergy in the War of the Revolution* (New York, 1891), p. 4.

49 *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg,* 3 vols., ed. Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein, Philadelphia, 1942-57.

50 Cf. W. W. Sweet, "Review of the Journals of H. M. Muhlenberg," *The Christian Century,* Dec. 5, 1945. See also, T. G. Tappert, *op. cit.,* p. 13.

and impartial judge of political happenings, always reluctant to commit himself for or against the cause of independence. On August 22, 1776, he made the illuminating observation that contending parties could not be their own judges and that private persons possessed no infallible scales to weigh the arguments of both sides. This was evident, he continued, in the writings and Parliamentary speeches for and against the Revolution. "Therefore, since the ministers neither can nor should be judges or arbitrators in such a conflict, they do best if they commit the whole thing to the only and highest judge of heaven and earth and follow the rule of the Spirit of God given through the Apostle Paul, Romans 13, 'Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers.' " It is of no little significance that this declaration of neutrality does not appear in the original journal which Muhlenberg kept for his own record, but that he added it to the transcript of his journal sent to Halle, in Germany, to be read by his politically indifferent Lutheran fellow-clergymen abroad.

Shrouded in mystery is the tearing out of five pages from Muhlenberg's original journal for 1775, on which the minister presumably expressed his opinion about the political conflict. Only the following few lines of the original manuscript entry, namely, those lines which manifest a neutral position, were preserved: "Inasmuch as our Lutheran congregational establishments, although small, are involved in all that happens, it is necessary to ask whether reason and revelation counsel us to conjugate in the active, passive, or neuter. . . ."[51] It is reasonable to assume that someone who wished to conceal Muhlenberg's political position tore out the said five pages. However, we suspect that Muhlenberg himself destroyed the pages after having realized that in taking a stand in the political struggle he was violating the professed neutrality of his clerical office. This conjecture is supported by the fact that the five pages were not included in the transcribed manuscript containing the "Observations in the form in which they are to be sent abroad," and that Muhlenberg thus deliberately withheld their contents from his German superiors, who, as we shall see, opposed political activity by clergymen. That Muhlenberg as a rule was extremely cautious in the selection of journal data he transmitted to Halle is confirmed by a letter to J. C. Kunze dated Dec. 9, 1783. In it

51 *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg,* II, p. 712.

he admitted having packed up and sent off manuscripts "without suitable revision and selection" and expressed concern that his "hasty reports and judgments could fall into improper hands and cause harm."[52]

Throughout his voluminous diaries, journals, and correspondence covering the turbulent pre-war years, Muhlenberg was strikingly reticent about the political issues of the time, and apart from some rare allusions to local politics no statements have come down to us that would permit us to determine his political opinions. This apparently "intentional silence"[53] or "reluctance to commit himself"[54] for or against the cause of independence probably finds its best explanation in Muhlenberg's own words that "ministers neither can nor should be judges or arbitrators in such a conflict." For William J. Mann, Muhlenberg's Lutheran biographer, it was natural "that many individuals, especially those serving the cause of religion and the church, would not utter their sentiments in so critical a period, whatever may have been their personal convictions."[55] The validity of Mann's statement can be questioned as far as the patriotic activity of the Calvinistic clergy is concerned. There exists little doubt, however, that, on the whole, Lutheran ministers responded to the political cause less spontaneously and with considerably greater mental reservation than their Calvinistic colleagues. Peter Muhlenberg's is *not* typical of the general attitude of the Lutheran clergy, and as a rule Lutheran ministers did *not* fire their audiences to political and patriotic excitement. On the basis of reports received from Lutheran preachers in the colonies, the German theologian Dr. Gottlieb A. Freylinghausen, of Halle, rejoiced "that our preachers are far from supporting or increasing the disturbances which have arisen in the body politic by inciting the minds of the people. They do well to preach repentance and conversion and faith in Christ and Christian discipleship to those who bear his name, and to give neither party occasion for increased bitterness. From that which Mr. [the Rev. Joh. Christoph] Kunze and Mr. [the Rev. J. C. Heinrich] Helmuth write about themselves, we may conclude with good reason

52 Information about the existence of this letter as well as the text of the above-mentioned quotations were furnished by Theodore G. Tappert, professor of Church History at The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, whose helpful suggestions are gratefully acknowledged.

53 W. J. Mann, *op. cit.*, p. 398.

54 W. W. Sweet, *The Christian Century*, Dec. 5, 1945.

55 W. J. Mann, *op. cit.*, pp. 480-481.

what the conduct of the other united preachers is. . . ."[56] To stress unduly the patriotic activity of Lutheran ministers during the Revolutionary War with the intention of exalting the value of Lutheran contributions to the cause of America, is to fail to recognize the traditional attitude of Lutheranism toward civil government, its aloofness from political matters and civil strife, and its fundamental adherence to the separation of church and state.

The political aloofness of the Lutheran clergy as shown during the War of Independence is in no way an exclusively American phenomenon; it has its almost contemporaneous counterpart in the politically reserved attitude of the Lutheran clergy in Prussia during the Seven Years' War. At approximately the same time that colonial pulpits resounded with the political controversies about the notorious Grenville reforms, when American clergymen defiantly entered the political scene, questioned the legality of the oppressive tax acts, and debated political theory, orthodox Lutheran clergymen in Prussia insisted upon the principle of the incompatibility of the clerical office and political or patriotic activity. They argued that in preaching on political subjects clergymen were transgressing the limits of their particular theological office, that the clergyman's kingdom was not of this world, and that an evangelical preacher should not become involved in temporal matters. Commenting on the letters Kunze and Helmuth had written him, Dr. Freylinghausen, director of the Halle institutions which had sent the preachers to Pennsylvania, laid down the following rule of conduct for Lutheran clergymen: "It would be improper for a disciple of the blameless Jesus, and it would be detrimental to the religion of Jesus, for his witness-bearers to meddle in secular affairs (weltliche Händel). . . ."[57] Carl Friedrich von Moser, one of the most ardent German patriots of the day and author of *Vom deutschen Nationalgeist* (1766), defined the true function of the clerical office as one of praying, comforting, and admonishing.[58] In taking an unequivocal stand against

56 *Nachrichten von den vereinigten Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Gemeinen in Nord-America, absonderlich in Pennsylvania* (Halle, 1768), II, p. 1375. See also L. P. Qualben, *The Lutheran Church in Colonial America* (New York, 1940), Chap. III. The author represents the viewpoint that Lutheran clergymen were enthusiastic patriots.

57 *Nachrichten von den vereinigten Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Gemeinen in Nord-America,* II, p. 1375. Cf. T. G. Tappert, *op. cit.,* p. 7.

58 Cf. D. de Levie, "Patriotism and Clerical Office, Germany 1761-1773," *Journal of the History of Ideas,* XIV (October, 1953), p. 622-627.

any mixture of the spiritual and the secular realms, and holding that to participate in temporal matters and to get involved in political quarrels was unbefitting the holder of a ministry, Freylinghausen as well as von Moser stood on the grounds of Lutheran tradition.[59]

Martin Luther had taken special pride in his interpretation of the rôle of temporal government, which, he believed, had never been so clearly described or so highly praised since the time of the apostles. In his treatise on "Secular Authority" (1523) he firmly established temporal authority, and, leaning heavily on the Apostles Peter and Paul, he defended its divine and independent character against the contemporary Roman Catholic viewpoint according to which all authority stemmed from the church. The doctrine of the existence of the two kingdoms, the kingdom of God to which belonged all true believers in Christ and the kingdom of the world to which belonged the faithful as well as the non-Christian and wicked, is one of the cornerstones of Luther's theology. He not only recognized and sanctioned the different nature of the two realms, but insisted that the secular and the spiritual powers be kept apart, and that the two spheres of church and state be sharply distinguished. For Luther, the individual Christian belonged to both realms, and submitted himself to a double rule, to the rule of Christ and that of the secular authority. Accordingly, the Christian acted in two different ways, depending on whether his actions originated within the sphere of his personal life as a Christian or that of his official secular duty. Confronted in his own days with the peril of Turkish aggression and the ensuing issue of a crusade against the pagan enemy, Luther enunciated most explicitly his conception of the separation of the callings and offices and of the incompatibility of clerical office and temporal-political activities. For instance, for the pope and the bishops to have a hand in the war was against Christ's will, "since they are called to fight against the devil with the Word of

59 Franz Lau, in his recent book, *Luthers Lehre von den beiden Reichen* (Berlin, 1952), admits "incredibly difficult practical problems" inherent in Luther's doctrine of the two realms and in his teachings on preaching (pp. 76-77), but this German theologian does not undertake to define sharply the scope of activity to which, in his opinion, the Lutheran minister is bound. Lau significantly suggests that in each particular case the clergyman ask his conscience and use his own judgment: "Beides entspricht Luthers Anliegen, der Dienst . . . des Predigtamtes an der politischen Welt und die Zurückhaltung des Predigtamtes gegenüber den Fragen, die die Politiker zu entscheiden haben. Der rechte Weg, den der Prediger zu gehen hat, ist ein sehr schmaler Grat, der auf keiner im Handel käuflichen Karte eingezeichnet ist, sondern in jeweils neuen ernsten und schweren Gewissensentscheidungen aufgefunden werden muss" (p. 78).

God and with prayer, and would be deserting their calling and office and fighting with the sword against flesh and blood. This they are not commanded, but forbidden to do." Luther was guided by Rom. 12 and I Cor. 12 when he called on Christians to keep the callings and offices apart, so that everyone could see to what he was called and fulfill the duties of his office faithfully. "For Paul will not suffer it that in the church, where all should be Christians, one assume another's office, but exhorts every member to his own work, so that no disorder arise, but everything be done in an orderly way. How much less, then, is the disorder to be tolerated that arises when a Christian leaves his office and takes upon him a temporal office, or when a bishop or pastor leaves his office and takes upon him the office of a prince or judge."[60] With the ultimate embodiment in the Augsburg Confession of Luther's doctrine that the offices and functions of the church and the civil authority be not confounded, the principle of the separation of the two powers was established in the Lutheran system.[61]

Although in theory Luther had drawn a sharp line of demarcation between the two spheres of the church and the state, historically, as is well known, the Lutheran movement ended in a legally compulsory church system, a state church in which the political authority, the ruling prince, determined what was true religion according to the Word of God. In contrast to the Genevan situation, where Calvinism could offer stability to the weak and immature political government, in Germany Lutheranism, because of the purely spiritual form of church government and the idealistic aspect of its conception of the church, came to depend on the protection and aid of the *brachium saeculare*. "Lutheranism realized that it could not stand alone; it was like some frail sapling which needed the robust support of a Christian state or a Christian society if its pure spirituality were ever to bear good fruit."[62] Espe-

60 *Works of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia, 1931), V, pp. 84-85.

61 Whether the correct interpretation of *all* of Luther's writings on the separation of the two realms and of all of Luther's own actions gives support to the renunciation of political interest on the part of Lutheran clergyman, and whether the Lutheran Church, after Luther's death, distorted and vulgarized Luther's doctrine—as Franz Lau (*op. cit.*, pp. 15-16) maintained —are questions which, although of greatest significance from the viewpoint of theology, can remain unanswered for this study. The fact remains that throughout the centuries Lutheran clergymen, both Orthodoxists and Pietists, took a markedly reserved if not negative attitude toward political affairs and as a result tended to accept uncritically the political status quo and to be obedient to the ruler in power and to the civil laws of the state.

62 Cf. E. Troeltsch, *op. cit.*, II, p. 516.

cially after the social disturbances of the 1520's, Luther came to seek the assistance of the ruling princes, whom he called upon to serve, so to say, as *Notbischöfe,* emergency bishops. In his *Vorrede zu den Visitationsartikeln* of 1528 Luther stressed the great need of the church and the temporary nature of the visitation program which he had entrusted to the secular authorities. Even though his concept of the *Notbischof* and his appeal to the princes were not meant to be a departure from his theory of the separation of the spiritual and the secular realms,[63] "Luther had unwittingly started down the road which was to lead to the territorial church under the authority of the prince."[64] The fact that since its early beginnings the Lutheran Church enjoyed a privileged position in the state and, unlike later Calvinism, was spared the religio-political struggles for self-preservation and religious freedom, accentuated even more the intrinsically non-political outlook of Lutheranism.

Until late in the eighteenth century the Lutheran clergy in Prussia by and large rejected participation in politico-secular issues and responded but faintly to the idea of patriotism which was given new impetus in Germany during the Seven Years' War. As late as 1785, the Lutheran minister Christian Ludewig Hahnzog, of Welschleben near Magdeburg, complained about the political apathy of his Lutheran colleagues, while his own patriotic sermons breathed the spirit of a new era.[65]

Only with the widening of the cleric's interest in activities not strictly theological and pastoral, brought about by Rationalism and the secularizing process engendered by the Enlightenment, did the cleric's new political outlook assert itself. From intense patriotism or nationalism among Prussian clergymen in the eighteenth century one may infer, with good reason, a weakening in the orthodox position of the individuals in question.[66] It is difficult to overemphasize the fact that the patriotism of Lutheran clergymen in Germany is, in many instances, linked to neological tendencies, and that patriotism, rather than being

63 Cf. L. W. Spitz, "Luther's Ecclesiology and his Concept of the Prince as Notbischof," *Church History,* XXII (June, 1953), pp. 16-24.

64 R. H. Bainton, *Here I Stand* (Nashville, 1951), p. 313.

65 Cf. D. de Levie, "The Patriotic Sermons of Christian Ludewig Hahnzog, Germany 1785," *The Journal of Modern History,* XXVI (March, 1954), pp. 36-39.

66 Cf. E. N. Anderson, *Nationalism and the Cultural Crisis in Prussia, 1806-1815* (New York, 1939).

a desired concomitant of religious orthodoxy, often developed in competition with it.

There is at least some evidence which lends support to the assumption that this correlation between patriotic activity and secularized thinking holds true also for colonial conditions.

In his report to his ecclesiastical superiors in Germany about the true state of affairs in the colonies during the early course of the Revolution, Dr. Helmuth, one of the prominent Lutheran ministers in colonial America, wrote that the political disturbances inflicted no small injury on religion and that the hearts of men were closed against the good Word of God. To him it appeared worth mentioning that not infrequently preachers publicly extolled American battle casualties as "martyrs," and that many clergymen served in the American army both as chaplains and as military officers. The whole population was determined to risk life and all things in defense of liberty, while the few who thought differently did not dare utter their sentiments. "Would to God," Helmuth wished, "that men would become as zealous and unanimous in asserting their spiritual liberty as they are in America in vindicating their political freedom." In his opinion it was best for a preacher to preach repentance and faith all the more earnestly now that the people were less willing to hear these things.[67] Kunze, likewise, deplored the weakening of religious sentiment and especially its effect upon church attendance and on the Holy Communion. "We are afflicted with war and hard times: our dear fellow-citizens are aware of this and slacken in their divine worship. They all become more corrupt."[68] The life stories of the younger Muhlenbergs, according to the Lutheran historian E. J. Wolf, illustrate the general tendency of an age in which the interests of the church were sacrificed to urgent and all-engrossing political and material issues.[69]

67 *Nachrichten von den vereinigten Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Gemeinen in Nord-America,* II, pp. 1367-1368.

68 J. C. Kunze, *Ein Wort für den Verstand und das Herz vom rechten und gebauten Lebenswege* (Philadelphia, 1781), Introduction.

69 E. J. Wolf, *The Lutherans in America* (New York, 1890), p. 296.

# Lutherans and Non-Denominational Youth Movements

By Leslie Conrad, Jr.

DURING the past twenty-five years, many non-denominational youth movements have sprung up in the United States—and they're still springing! Four of these movements have been, and still are, unusually successful: Youth on the March, Young Life, Word of Life, and Youth for Christ. Any of these just-named youth movements creates problems for a Lutheran pastor as soon as it sets up shop in his community; especially is this true of the fastest growing of the four, Young Life. In view of the fact that each movement is in excellent financial health, with no signs of tent-folding in sight, the organized church might as well get set for a long-term struggle.

The procedure we shall follow in this article is to present (1) a brief informational report about each movement, (2) a comparative study of the four movements, and (3) a discussion of the commendable and objectionable features of the movements from the point of view of a full-time Lutheran youth director.

It is advisable at the outset to explain what is meant by "non-denominational youth movements." The answer may best be given by defining a denominational youth movement. A denominational youth movement, organization, or auxiliary is one that is officially sanctioned or authorized by a denomination. The four movements under consideration are not sanctioned or authorized as official youth movements by any of the recognized Protestant bodies in the United States. Thus the movements are tagged "non-denominational."

## Brief Report About Each Movement

*Youth on the March* (headquarters: 730 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.) is the oldest of the four movements. It was the brain child of Percy Crawford, who is often referred to as "the pioneer of youth evangelism in the United States." Percy Crawford directs all the activities of Youth on the March through three corporations: Young People's Church of the Air, Inc.; King's College, Inc.; Pinebrook Foundation, Inc. These corporations operate the following enterprises: Youth on the March Radio Broadcast, coast-to-coast each Sunday afternoon over "about 200 stations" affiliated with the American Broadcasting Company network; "Pinebrook Praises," a daily half-hour devotional radio broadcast over six stations; Youth on the March Telecasts; Youth on the March Rallies; Pinebrook,

Shadowbrook, and Mountainbrook Camps; the King's College, Kings College, Del.; the Pinebrook Book Stores; the Pinebrook Book Clubs; Pinebrook Song Books; the "HIM" Clubs Program; and the Phi Gamma Fishing Clubs Program.

These enterprises are non-profit; any profit is converted into an expansion of the particular program or else diverted into a new venture. Contributions "are used 100% to win souls to Christ Jesus." Percy Crawford himself is paid a straight salary each year, regardless of how the corporations fare. No figures are available on the total expenses of the three corporations. Since much of the support is derived from contributions through the mail, it is of value to note that their radio broadcasts bring in "from five to ten thousand pieces of mail each week."

*Young Life* (headquarters Star Ranch, Colorado Springs, Col.) was organized by its present national field director, Jim Rayburn, in 1941. The Young Life Movement is adult-directed and adult-supervised. Its board of directors is composed of nineteen men whose age-span is from mid-thirty to plus-sixty. Most of the board members hold very responsible positions in the business world. Mr. H. J. Taylor, board chairman of Club Aluminum Co. and former president of Rotary International, has been on the Young Life board of directors for fourteen years.

Young Life never seems to be in want of funds. Its budget for 1955 was $330,000. Young Life operates four "million-dollar" ranches. These ranches serve as leadership training centers for the high school youth who are members of Young Life Clubs.

Young Life has centered around the personality of Jim Rayburn, who claims membership in the Presbyterian Church. However, Jim Rayburn was wise enough in 1941 to see that Young Life needed other leaders. There were five staff members during the first year of organization. At present there are more than one hundred full-time staff members.

"We will never become statistically prominent as a movement," predicts Rayburn. Nevertheless, Young Life has made marked strides since 1941. When Young Life began, it centered its activity in the state of Texas. By 1945 it had thriving centers at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill., and Bellingham, Wash. Since that time it has become a coast-to-coast movement.

*Word of Life* (headquarters: 140 Nassau Street, New York 7, N. Y.) is directed by lay preacher Jack Wyrtzen, who, by the way, held his first youth rally in a Lutheran church at Woodhaven, Long Island, N. Y. In addition to serving as director of Word of Life Fellowship, Wyrtzen is also director of the Word of Life Camp, the Word of Life Ranch, and the Word of Life Manor at Schroon Lake, N. Y. There are fifty-six overseas missionaries who are members of the staff of the Word of Life movement. Many of these missionaries made their decisions to serve in the foreign field while attending Word of Life Camp; others made decisions while attending Word of Life rallies.

Jack Wyrtzen believes that "the only answer to juvenile delinquency and the tragically low morale of this present generation is found in Jesus Christ and the Bible." Wyrtzen carries out his aims through the combined major channel of Saturday night rally-radio broadcasts. One-half hour of the Saturday night Word of Life rally is broadcast from the Gospel Tabernacle, Eighth Avenue and 44th Street, New York City. It is carried by 40 radio stations in the United States, Canada, and three foreign countries.

The financial policies of the Word of Life Fellowship are supervised by a board of directors of prominent businessmen. In addition to the board of directors there is an advisory council of "approximately 140 members, scattered throughout North America." Similar groups of older men are behind the movement in many cities. The Word of Life budget for 1955 was "approximately $315,000." Both on his radio program and in his rallies Wyrtzen claims that his total program expenses run "just about $6,000 a week."

*Youth for Christ* (headquarters: 109 North Cross Street, Wheaton, Ill.) got its start in July, 1945, when thirty-five youth leaders attended the first convention of Youth for Christ International at Winona Lake, Ind. The delegates drafted Torrey Johnson as the first president. Billy Graham became the movement's first full-time evangelist. Today Graham is first vice-president of Youth for Christ, and Johnson still remains on the board of directors. Robert A. Cook is president.

Youth for Christ International is "big business." The 1954-55 budget totaled $695,000, with 51% scheduled for overseas evangelism, 33% for domestic evangelism, and the remainder of the intake for administration and promotion.

There are twelve avenues of service of Youth for Christ: Saturday Night Rallies—the original trade mark of YFC; city-wide campaigns; Hi-School Bible Clubs—1,500 of them in 35 states with 500,000 members; world congresses and annual conventions; youth guidance program; servicemen's program; international evangelists; overseas efforts; films; women's auxiliary relief ministry; *Youth for Christ* magazine; Bible quiz and preacher-songleader contests.

### Comparative Study of the Four Movements

What is the primary objective of these four movements? Evangelization! As might be expected, their strategies vary. Young Life is interested in evangelizing the high school student—and nobody else. Youth for Christ's program is somewhat broader in that it extends its hands of evangelization to all youth, regardless of age. Youth on the March and Word of Life have no age limits whatsoever. They aim their heaviest evangelization artillery at young people. But they also reserve some mighty potent ammunition for adults, both in their rallies and in their far-reaching radio broadcasts. Summed up, we could say: Young Life is for

high school students; Youth for Christ is limited to youth; Youth on the March and Word of Life take in everybody, with the major emphasis on youth.

Each of the four movements proudly boasts a director whose name is all but synonymous with the movement. In fact, some would suggest that an injustice is committed if the movement and the director are not mentioned in the same breath. With the exception of Youth for Christ, each movement has been the brain child of its director. Each movement has had unusual success in attracting devotees and marshalling support. Such success leads to the inevitable question: Are these movements built on programs or personalities? Are these movements program-centered or personality-centered? Needless to say, in each movement the director's personality plays an important part. But in the Youth on the March Movement and Word of Life Movement, the role of director is similar to that of the playwright who also serves as producer, director, and leading character.

Summertime is camptime for three of the movements. During June, July, and August Youth on the March, Young Life, and Word of Life concentrate all energies and resources on their respective camping and ranching programs. As a movement Youth for Christ does not sponsor a camping program of its own. During 1955 the total number of camper-week registrations at the camps and ranches of the other three movements was approximately 30,000. The religious experiences of these tens of thousands of youth—most of whom are from Protestant churches—will certainly influence the church life of day after tomorrow. That influence will be felt whether they represent "main stream" or "babbling brook" type of Protestant churches.

Each of these movements is altogether autonomous. Each movement manages its own program and is responsible to no other organization, church, or denomination for its actions or its activities. Each movement is strictly non-denominational. However, each movement proudly considers itself to be inter-denominational. And in a very real sense it is inter-denominational, for none of them could exist very long were it not for the financial support they receive from adults and young people who are affiliated with organized Protestant churches in America.

One feature that is common to all four groups is their willingness to review and revise. By that we mean that they are opposed to stand-patism. Not one of the organizations is following the same simple program it featured during the first year of organization. Whenever the need for a new department has arisen, and money has been available, that new department has been opened. In fact, often the new department has been launched without the funds, on faith.

### Commendable and Objectionable Features

From the point of view of a Lutheran youth director, there are several praiseworthy features in these movements from which Lutherans could learn a few

lessons. On the other hand, there are several highly objectionable features that really cause concern. Among the commendable features the following may be cited:

1. *An exalted Bible.* The exalted place that these four movements reserve for the Bible deserves high commendation. They accept the Bible as God's Word. They teach the Bible; they study the Bible in private and in public; and they carry their Bibles with them to school, to work, to rallies, and to club meetings.

2. *Youth work know-how.* These four movements excel in youth work know-how. Their directors and leaders are specialists in youth psychology. Most of their success stems from their ability to meet youth on a common ground of understanding. They talk youth's language. Proof of this can be had by attending a single rally, or reading a single issue of their magazines, or listening to one of their broadcasts, or viewing one of their telecasts, or reading any of their promotional materials. Everything they do is beamed at the average teen-age intelligence in their audience.

3. *Enlistment of sponsorship and leadership.* The success that these movements have enjoyed in being able to enlist both sponsorship and leadership is amazing. It is certainly a matter worthy of serious consideration by Protestant bodies. Why do millionaires, who are members of Protestant denominations, contribute hundreds of thousands of dollars annually to non-denominational youth movements when their own denominations' youth programs are actually crying for funds? Why do high school youth turn their backs on their own congregational youth organizations for the fellowship of high school Bible Clubs? Why do self-appointed adult leaders make youth-filled taxis out of their automobiles and drive hundreds of miles to camp sessions and rally sessions sponsored by these movements?

Here are some of the answers. These movements have programs that are challenging. In most cases they are more challenging than the youth program of the average Protestant church. Furthermore, these movements have centered their efforts on youth—the most important segment of our population as far as serious-thinking adults are concerned. Each movement always has "something cooking"—that is to say, there is another project ready to be projected, necessitating more man-power and money-power for its promotion. The pat-on-the-back is a trade mark of all four movements. The pat is for both adults and youth, a gesture that is so often lacking in Protestant church life. There is plenty of proof of success, and who is there alive who does not enjoy the thrill of being a necessary part of a successful venture?

4. *Public profession of Christ.* One of the finest contributions that these movements make is their ability to impress upon youth the importance of publicly professing their faith in Jesus Christ. They do it with unbelievable success. With the active members of these groups Jesus Christ is Lord all week long! It makes no difference if they are attending a youth rally, or walking across the high school campus, or sipping cokes in a drugstore booth; they are not afraid to talk about

their Christian faith. Public profession of Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour is more than a matter for a Sunday school session or a Sunday morning church service. It is a seven-days-a-week proposition.

5. *Truth through personality.* These movements bring to light anew the importance of Phillips Brooks' definition of preaching as "truth through personality." The Lutheran Church has often erred in this respect. It has been satisfied to let truth speak "without personality." The emphasis has been on the Word without much regard for the preacher, the teacher, or the speaker of the Word. Or, to put it another way, the Lutheran Church at times has seemed to hold the opinion that the Word could speak for itself, just as long as there was a human being to serve as the reporting vehicle. These movements prove that personality still plays a potent role in presenting an effective witness.

There are also objectionable features: 1. *Omission of the sacraments.* The first glaring omission in the programs of these four movements is the sacraments. If there is one period of life when a person needs to be impressed with the importance of the sacraments, it is during his youth. In early teens Lutheran youth are catechized. Catechetical instruction directs attention to Baptism and the Lord's Supper. When a youth movement gives these means of grace "the silent treatment," except for occasional disparaging comments, young people might arrive at the place in their religious life where they wonder if the sacraments really have any value for the "truly converted, born-again person."

Of course, the reason for giving the sacraments such hush-hush treatment is obvious: the movements need not worry about getting into warm—or hot—water on their interpretation of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. An article in *Young Life* magazine provides the typical approach: "All kids from all churches learn to cooperate and share the Bible together at Young Life. Only the basics of Christianity that are in all major church denominations are taught at Young Life because we just take the Bible as it is."[1] Since consideration of the sacraments is eliminated in Young Life meetings, it is apparent that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are something less than "basics of Christianity."

In conversation, the director of one of the movements told me that he had once laid great emphasis on immersion but soon found it best to leave the matter alone in public. After listening to his radio broadcasts for several years, and reading many of his printed sermons, I cannot recall that he has mentioned Baptism in print or in person. Robert Cook, director of Youth for Christ, advises community YFC directors that the rally speaker must be God's man with a straight-from-the-shoulder Gospel message. He must dwell on the positive aspects of salvation and consecration and leave doctrinal hobbies alone. He must clearly state

1 Ruth Nalley, "To Be or Not To Be . . . A Young Lifer," in *Young Life*, XII (January, 1955), pp. 14-15.

*how* to be saved.[2] The Lutheran Church believes that any straight-from-the-shoulder Gospel message that aims to show the unsaved person *how* to be saved must include Bible-based information about Baptism.

2. *Movement-training for Lutheran youth.* The Lutheran Church has long contended that it should be responsible for the away-from-home Christian training of its own young people. This does not mean that the Lutheran Church is opposed to inter-denominational cooperation. On the community level, where community youth councils respect confessional and representative principles, Lutheran youth generally cooperate. However, the Lutheran Church is "jealous" of its responsibility and right to educate its youth in its understanding of the Christian faith. For this purpose it provides Sunday school classes, catechetical classes, and Luther League for teen-age youth. Thus, when non-denominational youth groups begin to lure active youth from their church moorings, creating divided religious loyalties, it is only natural for the church to view such procedures with misgivings. Furthermore, with the teachings and emphases at variance, spiritual frustration for the youth is often the result.

3. *The church—unloved!* Often one wonders if Youth on the March and Word of Life are really interested in the organized church of Jesus Christ. Jibes of one kind or another are hurled at the church at many of their rallies and in many of their broadcasts. At one of the recent Word of Life rallies in Philadelphia I heard Jack Wyrtzen say during the "invitation period": "Yes, you can join all the churches in the world and still go to the devil, to hell!" On his radio broadcasts, Wyrtzen features brief testimonials. The testifier usually reports in this fashion: "I used to go to church, but it wasn't fundamental; the preacher didn't preach about sin. Then, one night, I went to one of Jack Wyrtzen's rallies. . . ." The radio sermons and printed works of Percy Crawford are not generous to the organized church. Here are examples:

A young married woman wrote me, "Friends of mine told me that I must be born again." And she was upset about it. She said, "I go to church, I take God through the holy communion, and do you think I must be born again?" I referred her to the third chapter of John. . . . There Jesus said, "Except a man be born again he *cannot see* the Kingdom of God."[3]

In offering advice for personal evangelism work, Percy Crawford advises: "Your aim is not to get him to join a church. It is to get him to acknowledge Christ as Savior and Lord."[4]

A great Baptist preacher once said he wondered sometimes whether 60% of the members of his church were really born again. If this is so relative to this great man's church membership, what are the facts concerning the average church? It was the non-prodigal who was mad and it was recorded of him, "he would not go in." *Membership is the logical thing after the new birth but not before.*[5]

2 Robert A. Cook, *What and Why of Youth for Christ* (Wheaton, Ill.: Youth for Christ International, 1954), p. 14.

3 Percy B. Crawford, *Salvation Full and Free* (Philadelphia: The Young People's Church of the Air, 1943), pp. 22-23.

4 Percy B. Crawford, *The Art of Fishing for Men* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1950), p. 39.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 99. Italics mine.

Young Life contends that it is "an arm of the church." It urges youth who are brought to Christ to join a church and there bear a witness. This may be true in many cases. However, if the many testimonial feature articles in *Young Life* magazine may serve as a criterion, the church comes in for much uncomplimentary consideration. In the testimonial type article, the report-approach is as follows: "I was a member of a church, but it was a waste of time. And, then, someone invited me to attend a Young Life meeting; and socko! It was there I came to understand what Jesus can really mean to a young person." The stories vary somewhat, of course, but the general pattern is the same.

4. *Movements minus the voice of youth.* The Lutheran Church would certainly question one practice of these movements in eliminating youth from membership on their boards of directors. The Lutheran Church is convinced that youth have much to offer, even on directing boards and committees. Youth work is a cooperative venture. It should not be an orders-from-headquarters organization or a policy-made-by-adult-payers program. Youth auxiliaries and/or organizations of Protestant denominations benefit from the experience and guidance of adults; they also benefit from the fresh-from-the-field advice of youth.

5. *"Born-again Christian" interpretation.* The Lutheran Church has been a "family church" for centuries. By that we mean that the faith of the fathers has been passed on to their sons, generation after generation. Since the days of Martin Luther Lutherans have believed in infant baptism, and have practiced it. These factors have blended together to mark the Lutheran Church as a "gradual-conversion" type church. That is to say, Baptism usually precedes instruction. The majority of Lutherans cannot recall when they did not believe in Jesus Christ. They were dedicated to Christ during their cradle-days through the sacrament of Baptism.

This leads us to the point of questioning the "spontaneous conversion" type that is propagated by a majority of the leaders in the non-denominational youth movements. They lay great stress on the time and place of conversion. In hammering home the theme, "Ye must be born again"—flavored with incidents and stories of teen-age church members who were not honest-to-goodness "born-again" Christians—they force many baptized and confirmed youth to be perched on the horns of a dilemma. And there they are! Shall they go the way of the youth movement crowd, or shall they stick with the faith of their fathers and mothers, the faith into which they were reborn through Baptism shortly after birth?

From this Lutheran's point of view, the objectionable features overshadow the commendable features to such an extent that the present programs of all four movements are totally unacceptable.

# Martin Werner and "Angel Christology"

By John Reumann

AN IMPORTANT and stimulating book on the development of theological thought in early Christianity appeared in 1941, the work of Martin Werner, professor in the theological faculty at Bern.[1] The volume has received surprisingly little attention in the English-speaking world, presumably because of its appearance during the war.[2]

Werner, a pupil of Albert Schweitzer, is one of the few men who have attempted to write a full-fledged history of doctrine for the ancient church since the great "classical" *Dogmengeschichten* of Harnack, Loofs, and Seeberg a generation before. He writes with an awareness that new sources for patristic study have become available since the turn of the century, but also with the contention that most earlier writers on history of doctrine were at fault in dealing only with the first half of Harnack's famous dictum that "dogma in its conception and development is a work of the Greek spirit on the soil of the Gospel."[3] Werner therefore proposes to pay more attention to the "soil of the Gospel" from which all later development stems. And here he reflects a particular trend in New Testament scholarship which has emerged since 1900: the emphasis on eschatology, championed especially by Albert Schweitzer.[4] Werner, to put his main thesis as briefly as possible, sees this eschatological emphasis as the basic element in the

1 Martin Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas problemgeschichtlich dargestellt* (Bern and Leipzig: Verlag Paul Haupt, 1941; second edition, with preface rewritten in light of reviewers' criticisms, with indices added, 1953); cited below as Werner, the page numbers of both editions being the same, unless otherwise indicated.

2 The most thorough discussion of the book which I have found is in Werner Georg Kümmel's survey article, "Das Urchristentum: IV. Die Entwicklung der unchristlichen Gedankenwelt," *Theologische Rundschau*, Neue Folge, 17 (1948/49), 108-112; unfortunately the files in this country for most European theological journals for 1941-45 are incomplete because of the war, but doubtless other reviews must have appeared. I have not noticed any reviews of the book by periodicals in English, though a brief summary and criticism will be found in H. E. W. Turner's *The Pattern of Christian Truth* (London, 1954), pp. 20-23, and a passing reference in Turner's earlier volume, *The Patristic Doctrine of Redemption* (London, 1952), p. 13; Amos N. Wilder, *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus*, revised edition (New York, 1950), pp. 46 f., also notes Werner's book.

3 Werner, vii ff.; second edition, 1 ff., especially 28-36. Harnack's original statement occurs in his *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, I, 20; in the English translation, *History of Doctrine*, I, 17.

4 For Schweitzer's reconstruction of Jesus' life, see his famous volume, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus* (London, 1910) and, more briefly, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* (New York, 1950), 160-173.

soil from which primitive Christianity arose, and the non-fulfillment of the promised parousia as the most significant feature in the development of the early church. Because the second coming did not take place as expected, there occurred, Werner holds, a process of "de-eschatologization" (*Enteschatologisierung*) and in its wake the rise of dogma. He thus views the construction of the fundamental doctrines in the primitive church as a consequence of the delay of the parousia.

This article will attempt to summarize Werner's chief theme in some detail; then to observe one of his subsidiary theories which has prompted considerable discussion in European publications, namely, that "the primitive Christian doctrine of the person of Christ" was an "angel Christology" (*Engelchristologie*); and finally to examine several significant areas of evidence upon which Werner rests this latter claim.

After brushing aside the scepticism of the form critics as to whether a life of Jesus can be reconstructed, Werner paints his Schweitzerian Jesus in eschatological colors. Jesus, he says, originally expected that the intervention of the kingdom of God would occur during his own lifetime, and with it the elevation of the Son of Man to God's right hand—indeed, in sending out the twelve to preach he assumed that the Son of Man would be revealed before they had gone through all the towns of Israel (Matt. 10:23). But this failed to happen, and in the light of this first eschatological delay Jesus had to revise his views, now concluding that the cataclysmic intervention of the kingdom would come only with his own passion and death at Jerusalem. Thus far the familiar views of Schweitzer.

Werner then goes on to assert (pp. 74 ff.) that after Jesus' death his disciples continued to think that the previously delayed irruption of the kingdom into the world would soon take place, triggered now by their Master's sacrificial death. Momentary, visionary appearances of Jesus, risen from the dead, convinced them that he was already elevated to the position of honor as Messiah, and daily they expected his coming again. Thus the disciples eagerly proclaimed their kerygma:

> Jesus of Nazareth, a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs which God did through him in your midst, . . . this Jesus you crucified and killed by the hands of lawless men. But God raised him up. . . . Therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified, being exalted at the right hand of God (Acts 2:22, 23b, 24a, 36, 33).

The original Jewish-Christian community expected the parousia soon on the basis of Jesus' death and resurrection, and the continuing history between this death and the parousia had for them already taken on an eschatological flavor through the ecstatic experience of the outpouring of the Spirit, long before mentioned by Joel (2:28-32, Hebrew 3:1-5) as a certain sign of the last times.

But the parousia did not take place immediately. Reinterpretation of the death of Jesus was necessary, and at this crucial moment, enter Paul! From the original

kerygma Paul derived the emphasis that, in Jesus, the Christ has appeared to fulfill his Messianic task in death and resurrection. From the eschatological teaching of late Jewish apocalyptic he borrowed the idea that the task of the heavenly Messiah includes the introduction of the end of the world and the consummation of the new aeon. Paul accordingly interprets Jesus' death to mean that the real turning point of the ages has come, though not visibly. Paul, too, believes in the nearness of the parousia, but he adds some further corollaries to his emphasis that the new age is here. Jesus' death he regards as a victory over the angelic powers; their hold on men is broken. Furthermore—and this brought him into conflict with Jewish-Christians—the authority of the law given, as Paul significantly insists, by angels at Sinai, is now abrogated. The period of the general, final resurrection has broken in. Jesus is the first fruit among many brethren (I Cor. 15:20-24), and the old world has begun to pass away. As a key to the whole thought of Paul, Werner stresses (pp. 188 ff.) the verse at Gal. 6:14, "Far be it from me to glory except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world." This is the Pauline reconstruction of the meaning of the cross.

The parousia, however, still did not occur. In this second period of eschatological delay, beginning two decades or so after Jesus' death when the first group of believers was dying out, and extending on as a crisis from about A.D. 50 to 100, the death of Jesus again had to be reinterpreted, this time in a non-eschatological sense. The Pauline synthesis that treated the death on the cross, victory over angelic powers, the end of the law, and ethics as a unity broke down into isolated fragments devoid of the original eschatological fervency. Paul's "end of the Law" motif was lost, and the Gospel became a *nova lex;* the ethic of the interim became an ethic of the Law. No longer did believers hold that the world has been crucified in Christ, but they regarded the crucifixion of the world as a task which each believer must accomplish for himself in his own life. Pauline asceticism, divorced from eschatology, now became an asceticism of piety. The communal meal of the new age became a "medicine of immortality," and the charismatic, eschatological community became a hierarchically ordered institution.[5] Thus did dogma arise, Werner says, as the eschatological hope withered away.

In Paul's reinterpretation of the meaning of Jesus' death—to turn to our second point, angel Christology—there is a marked difference from the kerygma of the earliest Jewish-Christianity. Instead of talking about "the man Jesus who has been elevated to honor as Lord and Christ," Paul introduces the opinion, Werner insists, that Jesus was no mere man but a higher angelic being with whose death and resurrection the new aeon begins.

This sort of Christology, Werner further holds (pp. 302 ff.), was not actually new with Paul but had its roots in late Jewish apocalyptic; thus, according

5 Werner, 105 ff., 188 ff.; cf. Turner, *Pattern of Christian Truth,* 21.

to the book of Enoch and other sources, the Son of Man is said to appear as "a being of the higher angel world," a view for which Werner claims the support of Schweitzer, Wilhelm Bousset, and Rudolph Otto. He also sees this type of Christology reflected in many details in the Synoptic Gospels, where the Son of Man is often spoken of as coming "with his holy angels."[6] Indeed, to cite a point which Werner misses, it is even possible to speak of a triad in the New Testament in which the Father, the Son of Man, and the holy angels are grouped together.[7] In Paul, of course, Werner finds further specific evidence for such an angel Christology derived from Jewish apocalyptic.[8]

All this evidence, Werner argues (p. 305), presupposes "the connection of Christology with the presentation of a strongly hierarchical, graduated ordering of the heavenly angel kingdom in many layers." Christ is "a being of this higher angel world, created by God and chosen for the task of introducing at the end of the times the new aeon of the kingdom of God in the battle with the spiritual powers of the existing world" (p. 311). This angel Christology Werner regards as the primitive view of Christ's person. What is more, he attempts to find traces of it throughout the patristic period, although the view was gradually being overwhelmed in the rise of dogma as a result of the non-fulfillment of the parousia. But Werner traces the view all the way down to Arianism in the fourth century, which he regards as a dying gasp of angel Christology.[9]

It is about this Christological theory, which is not wholly new[10] (though Werner's emphasis on it and effort to trace it into the patristic period are), that most controversy has centered. Shortly after the appearance of Werner's book, in 1942, a colleague in the field of New Testament at Bern, Wilhelm Michaelis, answered the theory with a 240-page monograph.[11] In a minute examination of each shred of evidence, Michaelis again and again denies Werner's "examples"

6 E.g., Mark 8:38, Matt. 16:27, Luke 9:26; Matt. 13:41 ff.; Mark 13:26 ff.; cf. also Mark 1:13 (Matt. 4:11); Luke 22:43, and I Thess. 4:16.

7 See J. B. Bernardin, "A New Testament Triad," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 57 (1938), 273-279. Bernardin offers as examples Mark 8:38, 13:32; Luke 12:8, 9; I Thess. 3:13; Rev. 1:4, 5, 3:5; and I Tim. 5:21. Such a triad assumes one God, with Christ subordinated to him, and other divine beings subordinated to him in turn. This triad, Bernardin holds, disappeared under the influence of the unique relationship to God which Jesus was felt to have, the common Christian experience of the Spirit, and the implicit danger of polytheism, but its very existence shows (p. 279) that "there is no doctrine of the Holy Trinity to be found within the New Testament, although . . . the New Testament contains the elements out of which that doctrine of the church was later formulated."

8 Werner, 305 ff., stressing Phil. 2:6 ff., I Cor. 15:45, II Cor. 4:4.

9 On angel Christology and Gnosticism, see Werner, 332 ff.; angel Christology and the Trinity, 338 ff.; angel Christology and the Arian controversy, 371 ff.

10 E.g., E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology* (London, 1955), 105 ff., hints at the idea but with an awareness of the full range of materials, Jewish and Hellenistic, on which the early church drew in constructing its Christology.

11 W. Michaelis, *Zur Engelchristologie im Urchristentum: Abbau der Konstruktion Martin Werners* (Gegenwartsfragen Biblischer Theologie, I, Basel, 1942).

and concludes (p. 187) that "primitive Christianity did not know any angel Christology." In a review of Werner's book W. G. Kümmel dismisses angel Christology as "untenable" because the notion cannot really be demonstrated either in late Judaism or in early Christianity.[12] A. Gilg, of the Old Catholic faculty at Bern, reached a similar conclusion that "a tradition which reaches from late Judaism through Jesus and the apostles into the early church is not to be found" for angel Christology.[13] And the British patristics scholar H. E. W. Turner has characterized Werner's theory as displaying "more learning than judgment, more ingenuity than conviction."[14]

On the other side of the fence, however, a thesis written by a Roman Catholic at Bonn in 1941, of which Werner knew nothing at the time, seems to support his views in part.[15] Hans Joachim Schoeps, in a work on Jewish-Christianity completed in 1949, hints at such a Christology among the Ebionites.[16] A recent article by Felix Scheidweiler, "Novatian und die Engelchristologie," while offering the dubious argument that Werner's theory need not be untenable simply because angel Christology does not happen to be demonstrable either in Judaism or in primitive Christianity, presents a significant bit of negative evidence: the opening chapters of the epistle to the Hebrews are a polemic against angel Christology, thus proving its existence![17]

Perhaps the most helpful thing this report can do in conclusion is to examine three crucial areas of evidence adduced for Werner's view in order to indicate some of the matters involved. Basic to Werner's theory is his contention that angel Christology derives from late Jewish apocalyptic. In these apocalyptic writings, he states (pp. 303 ff.), the Son of Man or the Chosen One is basically a creaturely being of the higher angel world, selected by God for his Messianic purposes.[18]

12 *Theologische Rundschau,* Neue Folge, 17 (1948/49), 110.

13 *Theologische Zeitschrift* (1954), pp. 113 ff. Cf. also A. Debrunner, *Der Kirchenfreund* (1942), pp. 274 ff.

14 Turner, *Pattern of Christian Truth,* 143.

15 J. Barbel, *Christos Angelos. Die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christlichen Altertums. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Ursprungs und der Fortdauer des Arianismus* (Bonn, 1941). Werner, in the preface to his second edition, vi ff., points out how Barbel, working independently, reached similar conclusions about the same time: namely, that the presentation of Christ as an angelic being is found not only in heretics but also in the more orthodox writers of the post-apostolic period; that angel Christology is a continuation of pre-Nicene subordinationistic concepts of Christ; and that this view leads finally to Arianism, as the sub-title suggests.

16 Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Theologie des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen, 1949), 78-82, especially 80, note 2, where he refers to the work of Barbel, Werner, and Michaelis, commenting that the last writer is not correct in his contentions with regard to Jewish-Christians.

17 *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* Vierte Folge, LXVI (1954/55), 126-139.

18 Thus Werner argues (pp. 303 ff.) that the idea of the election of such a Son of Man from the angelic beings in Enoch stands in closest relationship to the Synoptic Son of Man Christology, as at Mark 1:11, Luke 9:35 and 23:35, and Rom. 1:4; the relation of the Messianic figure to God depends upon his election by God. Michaelis replies (p. 13) that the Marcan

There is no unanimous agreement among scholars as to whether the apocalyptic figures who appear in Daniel (7:13, "one like a son of man") and in II Esdras (7:29, "my son the Christ," 13:25 ff., "he whom the Most High has kept for a great season") are specifically portrayed as angelic beings.[19] The matter therefore depends primarily on a series of passages in the book of Enoch. In Enoch the title "my Chosen One" is several times applied to the Messiah (Ethiopian Enoch 40:5, 45:3, 49:2, 51:3, 5, 52:6, 9, 61:5, 8, 62, 1), and Werner believes (pp. 303 f.) that this Messiah must therefore be a "creaturely being" chosen out of a series of other such beings who exist along with him. Michaelis points out (pp. 16 ff.), however, that this title, "chosen one," is employed not merely with reference to the Messiah in Enoch but also with reference to the people of Israel and for the angels generally ("elect angels") and that it does not therefore require any such interpretation.

Two passages are especially put forth by Werner to demonstrate that in Enoch the Messiah is a being of the angel world. First, at 46:1,

> And there I saw One who had a head of days,
> And his head was white like wool,
> And with him was another being whose countenance had the appearance of a man,
> And his face was full of graciousness, *like one of the holy angels.*[20]

This imagery, drawn from Daniel 7, appears elsewhere in comparisons (cf. I Sam. 29:9, Acts 6:15) and is, Michaelis contends (p. 17), nothing more than a comparison; logically the Son of Man here cannot be an angel, else there would be no point in comparing him with an angel! The second passage is at 61:10, where the Chosen One is included in the heavenly host, thus implying that he is an angelic being:

> And he [God] will summon all the host of the heavens, and all the holy ones above, and the host of God, the Cherubin, Seraphin, and Ophannin [or wheels of Ezekiel 1:15] and all the angels of power, and all the angels of principalities, and the Elect One, and the other powers on the earth (and) over the water.[21]

passage does not show clearly whether Jesus was *first* being designated as Son here at the baptism or had been so designated *earlier*. The two citations in Luke suggest that he is "chosen or beloved Son" with reference to the *Passion*, which is not the notion of election in the book of Enoch. Finally Rom. 1:4 specifically says that he became "son of God with power . . . by his *resurrection* from the dead."

19 Michaelis, 16, reaches a negative conclusion.

20 R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1912), 85, italics mine.

21 Charles, *Enoch*, 121. The "angels of power and all the angels of principalities" seem to be reflected in Paul's "principalities and powers" (Eph. 1:21, Col. 1:16; cf. Jude 8, II Peter 2:10); the fact that there thus seems to have been a class of angelic beings called *kyriotes* (in support of which, see W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Berlin, 1952, col. 835) is taken by Werner (p. 308) as additional evidence for his claim that *kyrios* was used as a title for angels in the New Testament period, a point discussed below.

Here, Michaelis replies, it is by no means clear whether the Messiah is meant as the Chosen One; and if there is a reference to the Son of Man as Chosen One "who next to God himself occupies the highest place of heavenly honor," then he can in no sense appear in the *middle* of this enumeration of classes of angels—he should appear at the *beginning,* or at the *end* as a climax![22] Thus, Michaelis concludes (p. 21), there is no real evidence that the book of Enoch presents an angel Christology or that anywhere in late Jewish apocalyptic the Messiah was pictured as an angel.

A second important argument advanced by Werner (pp. 307 ff.) is that the title *kyrios,* applied to Christ in the New Testament, is connected with the concept of him as an angelic being, an insight which has long been hindered, he adds, by the opinion that the word has reference to the Septuagint translation of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew. Thus Paul, he notes, often applies *kyrios* to Jesus, but never *theos,* suggesting perhaps that Paul therefore deliberately reserves *kyrios* for Jesus as an angelic being but declines to call him god. To buttress his argument, Werner brings in evidence that in late Judaism and early Christianity angels were called *kyrioi.*[23]

This evidence is examined in detail by Michaelis. First he surveys (pp. 61-70) Paul's use of *kyrios* in Septuagint citations. It is true that in these quotations Paul generally reserves the title *theos* for God—just as elsewhere he does not seem to apply *theos* to Jesus[24]—but this does not prove that he reserved *kyrios* for Jesus as an angelic being. In fact, in a majority of the citations from the Septuagint where *kyrios* occurs, the term is applied to God, not to Jesus.[25] Hence, Michaelis concludes, when Paul designates Jesus as *kyrios,* he cannot mean that Jesus is merely an angelic being; rather he intends to give him the name of God himself,

22 Michaelis, 18 f., who further contends that while the Ethiopic manuscripts here all read the singular, "the Chosen One," they should be emended to the plural, a point not followed by Charles. Michaelis also examines other passages in Enoch not given by Werner, like 48:3 and 6, where the pre-existence of the Son of Man is taught; in no case, however, is it stated that he was, prior to his election, a creaturely being or angel. Cf. further W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (1936), 263, where the Son of Man in Enoch is called "ein engelartiges Wesen," but nothing more; and Werner Küppers, *Das Messiasbild der spätjüdischen Apokalyptik* (Bern, 1933), 47, who says that the figure at Enoch 46:1 and 61:8 ff. is "neither an angel nor a power."

23 In addition to the passage discussed below, Werner gives the evidence that *kyrios* is often applied to an angel in late Jewish apocalypse (II Esdras; Greek Baruch); in early Christian apocalypses (Rev. 7:14, Hermas Mandates 4:1.4, 6, and 7; 4:3.1; 4:4.1; 8:2, 3, 5, 8, 11; 11:1, 7, 19; 12:1.3; 3.1; 3.4). Cf. further Hippolytus *Refut.* 5.26.6, and I Cor. 8:5, where there is reference to many *kyrioi* but one *kyrios* whom God chose to be ruler for the last times, Werner assumes, a notion given some slight comfort in Bauer, *Wörterbuch,* col. 834.

24 The two most important places where Paul seems to call Jesus *theos* are Rom. 9:5 and Titus 2:13, on which see the commentaries and Bauer, *Wörterbuch,* col. 647.

25 Out of 22 passages where Paul uses *kyrios* in a Septuagint quotation, 16 of the cases apply the word to God, three to Christ, and three are doubtful (for a full discussion, see Michaelis, 67 f.).

*kyrios,* the revealed tetragrammatic name YHWH of the Old Testament, as at Philippians 2:9-11.[26]

To examine Werner's other evidence, when Enoch 9:4 refers to God as "Lord of lords," this need not mean lord of angels since the verse also calls him "God of gods and King of kings," a phrase going back to Deut. 10:17. Werner's "clear evidence" in the New Testament itself amounts to three verses in Acts. When Peter, in his vision at Joppa (10:14), is addressed by an anonymous angel voice, "Rise, Peter, kill and eat," he responds, "No, lord (*kyrie*)." But this reply does not prove that *kyrios* was a regular term of address for angels. The word may mean simply "sir," and besides, as Michaelis notes (p. 76), Peter had been praying to God or Christ, not an angel, just prior to this vision. At Acts 9:5 Saul answered the heavenly voice, "Who are you, lord (*kyrie*)?" Werner argues that there were no more theophanies in the New Testament period (a point Michaelis concedes) and that hence *kyrios* was the normal response to an angelic being. The exact sense of *kyrios,* however, is debatable here. "Sir" or "my lord" might catch the sense since some commentators hold that Saul did not know as yet who was speaking to him. But Michaelis suggests that the voice had already identified itself—"Why do you persecute *me?*"—and Saul had been persecuting Jesus and his followers, not an angel; Saul's question amounts then to saying, Michaelis deduces, "Are you, Jesus, really the Messiah?"[27] The clearest evidence Werner can adduce appears to be at 10:4, where Cornelius addresses an angel of God (*angelos tou theou*) who appears to him with the words, "What is it, *kyrie?*" This would seem to be a border-line case, either "sir" or "lord" being possible renderings,[28] but it is as close as the examples come to showing unambiguously that *kyrios* was a regular title for angels. Werner here is presenting a theory contrary to the frequent assumption that when *kyrios* is applied to Jesus by Paul and other writers the word is meant as the Septuagint equivalent of the revealed name *Yahwê*. The evidence he brings is not in itself completely convincing proof for his own claim that *kyrios* refers instead to an angelic being, but perhaps it does warrant a re-examination of the traditional view.

The final specimen argument to be noted here is the suggestion that Hebrews 1-2 is polemic against angel Christology. There is an obvious appeal to such a theory: it provides vivid background for the opening argument of the epistle. Ac-

26 On the question of whether *kyrios* stands for the Old Testament Yahwê, see especially the thorough examination of evidence in G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,* 3, 1056-85, and, further, W. W. Graf Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte* (4 vols., 1926-29).

27 Werner, 309, discussed by Michaelis, 76 f. F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1951), 198, says on 9:5, "'Sir,' 'My Lord'; a title of respect, as Saul did not yet know who was speaking to him."

28 Bruce, *Acts,* 216, renders 10:4 as "Sir, my lord, no theological significance here." *The Beginnings of Christianity,* ed. J. F. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (London, 1935), goes a bit further (Vol. 4, p. 113): "Sir . . . or lord? A border-case."

tually such a view, claiming that these chapters are polemical refutation of a Jewish opinion which held the Messiah to be an intermediate spirit or angel, goes back at least to Tholuck's commentary of a century ago, and has been reflected in various forms since them—in the view that the material is directed either against those who gave too high a place and divinity to angels, or more specifically against Jewish-Christians of the Gnostic variety who believed that Christ himself belonged to the angelic creation.[29] To cite one illustration, Hans Windisch writes, "Jewish speculation about angels has possibly caused an influence on the Christology of Hebrews (as of the entire primitive Christian church); in any case, the author goes to the trouble of working out a view of Christ which presents all that is rightly believed of angels."[30]

On the other hand, a variety of commentators, both recently and in the last century, maintain that there is no polemic in the verses against angel worship but, if anything, against the Law which was given by angels (2:2; cf. Gal. 3:19), or against the earlier revelations given through prophets and angels (1:1, 4), which the Son now supersedes.[31] There is no clear-cut conclusion possible from a run-down of the standard commentaries, and perhaps a fresh investigation is needed to test Werner's thesis at this point. Even if proven, however, such evidence would be of a negative, though significant, nature on the existence of angel Christology in primitive Christianity.

The three areas of evidence examined above show how tenuous Werner's material is in places. However, it is unfair to judge his argument on isolated passages without looking into the mass of documentation he provides; his total point of view must be considered, not just individual items. After any examination, lengthy or brief, one may agree with Turner's earlier appraisal that Werner's book is "brilliant, learned, and perverse."[32] But certainly some of the suggestions presented

29 A. Tholuck, *Kommentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer,* 3rd edition (Hamburg, 1850). The view that Hebrews 1-2 is aimed at those who value angels too highly is expressed by T. H. Robinson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1933), 7; specific reference to such Jewish Gnostic Christians is made by Marcus Dods in *The Expositor's Greek Testament,* 4, 253 (on Heb. 1:4).

30 Hans Windisch, *Der Hebräerbrief* (Tübingen, 1931), 13, cf. 17, where evidence is given for the existence of angel cults in late Judaism and early Christianity.

31 The view that there is no polemic is taken by G. Lünemann, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Meyer's Critical and Exegetical Handbook, Eng. tr., New York, 1890), 399, against Tholuck's view; R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Columbus, 1938), 42 f., though his statement that "the Jews never worshiped angels" requires some correction in the light of Windisch's evidence (see note 30 *supra*); and Alexander C. Purdy in the *Interpreter's Bible,* Vol. 11, pp. 587 f. E. C. Wickham, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1910), 5, draws attention to the possible polemic against the Law. On this general view, cf. further, R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (New York, 1951-55), Vol. 1, pp. 129, 132.

32 Turner, *Pattern of Christian Truth,* 20. The chief objections which can be brought against Werner's main thesis are obviously, first, that elements of dogma already appear in the earliest forms of the kerygma and in the Pauline theology, and, second, that the Church Fathers carried

are worthy of more attention than they have received thus far by scholars in the English-speaking world.

eschatology over into their thought and creeds—e.g., the chiliasm of Irenaeus and Origen. Werner's theory, that heresy was a symptom of the great crisis of the post-apostolic period when eschatology withered away and that the "great church" or "Catholic Christianity" which gained the day is merely the most successful of a number of heresies arising after the decline of primitive eschatology, is succinctly criticized by R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament,* II, 137 f. Bultmann argues that the non-occurrence of the parousia was "a *conditio sine qua non* rather than a positive cause" for the rise of heresies; indeed, the motifs of the later heresies were already present in the Hellenistic Christianity of the apostolic period, so that Bultmann prefers to say, "Catholic Gnosticism is not the result of disappointed expectation of the parousia; rather . . . the rejection of realistic eschatology is a consequence of the Gnostic thinking" (p. 138). Elsewhere, however, Bultman agrees with Werner's theory that with the decline of eschatological consciousness the church's understanding of itself was transformed (II, 110 ff.).

# Life and Thought in World Lutheranism

## Methodology in Sweden

The professor of Theological Ethics in Lund University, Gustaf Wingren, is currently conducting a spirited battle on two fronts: against the high church tendency in Sweden, especially its emphasis on the office of the ministry; and against the Lundensian theology, especially the theology of Bishop Nygren.

The attack on Lundensian theology was delivered in a recent book, *Teologiens metodfragra* (Lund, 1954), the problem of theological method. On February 7 a debate was held before the Theological Society in Lund between Bishop Nygren and Professor Wingren. The introductory statements were published in *The Swedish Theological Quarterly*, January, 1956. Prof. Wingren's criticism involves two points: (1) That the combination of a categorical, philosophical question and an answer found in history imposes a foreign pattern on the biblical material which it is intended to interpret. (2) That by taking the agape motif by itself as fundamental, the law cannot be adequately recognized. The questions which are to be answered have been formulated without reference to the historical material out of which the answers are to be derived. Bishop Nygren answers that the professor is guilty of using terms in two different senses without distinction, and that he misunderstands the purpose of Nygren's work. The debate so far seems to be inconclusive, but Professor Wingren is now under obligation to produce a positive theological method which will enable him to interpret the biblical material adequately.

On the second front Professor Wingren carried on a long debate last year about apostolic succession, which closed with a general consensus that the Lutheran Confessions do not accept this doctrine as an essential mark of the church. Now some have alleged that in this discussion Professor Wingren had referred to the laying on of hands as "a technical detail" without much significance. These writers point out that the laying on of hands is a practice referred to frequently in the New Testament. The discussion now has shifted from the Confessions to the New Testament. The assistant professor of the New Testament in Upsala, Bertil Gaertner, argues that II Tim. 1:6 shows that only Paul had laid his hands on Timothy, and not the presbyters, as may be inferred from I Tim. 4:14. Wingren answers that he has never denied that the practice of laying on of hands is found in the New Testament, but he maintains that the claim of the Anglicans that the laying on of hands by a bishop is necessary for a valid ordination has no basis in the New Testament. This is not an ordinance instituted by Christ but is a later practice introduced in the church. He maintains that the laying on of hands by a bishop in Norway and Denmark, without

apostolic succession, is just as valid as in the Anglican or the Swedish churches. At present some pastors ordained in Norway are serving in the Church of Sweden.

In 1951 the Diet of the Church appointed a commission to study the relationship between church and state. This commission has now made its report, which will become the basis of discussion and possible clarification of the issue. The Church Diet was established in 1866 and meets every five years. But its authority and competence in the enactment of laws governing the church have never been very clear. The commission offers an outline of a new church law which would give the church greater freedom to decide matters which affect its own life.

The relationship between church and state in Sweden is peculiar and complicated. We are reminded in reading this report that the problem is an old one. The fundamental church law goes back to 1686, although many changes have been made since. A local congregation is free to care for its own affairs both financially and in regard to its own interests. In a folk church, the state is within the church just as the church is within the state. But nevertheless there are problems both of a practical and of a theological nature. This is evident, for example, when the report states that the church should be a folk church open to all and at the same time a congregation of the faithful. That might be thought of as an ideal toward which the church would strive but never quite hope to attain.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

LARS LEVI LAESTADIUS

Some of us may have heard of Laestadianism, a movement of spiritual awakening which originated in northern areas of Sweden, Finland, and Norway in the middle of the nineteenth century and which has found organized expression among immigrant Finns in America in the Apostolic Lutheran Church (divided into three separate groups). But the person of Lars Levi Laestadius is quite unknown. In recent years competent historical research has begun to unfold the outlines of this unusual figure, particularly through the writings of Havas, Castren, Zidbäck, and Bäcksbacka. In 1949 the Church Historical Society of Finland published the religious-philosophical work of Laestadius, "A Dweller in the House of the Insane," the manuscript of which had been long sought for until found in the unyielding hands of a "disciple" at Calumet, Michigan.

Laestadius was born in the Lapp country of northern Sweden in 1800. His father, a pioneer farmer, was a descendant of several generations of Lutheran pastors who had worked in that bleak and impoverished land. Partly Swedish and partly Lapp, the Laestadius family had labored with missionary zeal among the Lapps, teaching them to read, translating the Bible, and preparing a hymnal. Petrus Laestadius, an older brother, described the grim conditions of life thus: "This is a horrible place, hidden behind the snow-covered mountains that seem to reach to the heavens. There is hardly any soil, only heaps of stones surrounded by chilling swamps on every side. Thousands of

birds fly over and form a sort of mist in the sky during the short summer, and on the first night of the autumn there rises out of the earth a cold fog which spreads the mantle of death over all plant life."

Despite the forbidding journey from the frozen north to the cultural centers, the university of Upsala and the city of Stockholm, many members of the Laestadius family acquired an excellent education. At Upsala Laestadius earned his living as a private tutor. He lived frugally and imposed severe moral restraints upon himself, although a later analysis of his conduct during student days led him to observe that he had striven to live a pure life for selfish reasons, to avoid shame and to enhance his pride. He was deeply interested in natural science, and he shared some of the botanical experiments of his professor. He cultivated his botanical interests through most of his life and won international recognition for his immense collection and detailed analysis of the plants of Lappland. He wrote treatises on this subject and served as a consultant to a French botanical expedition to Lappland. He also kept daily records of weather conditions.

At the age of twenty-five he was ordained a minister in the Church of Sweden. For a brief period he worked as a missionary among the Lapps. A Stockholm business man, Casstrom, interested in botany, influenced the bishop to assign the young Laestadius to the northernmost parish of the land, Kaarresuvanto, on the border of Sweden and Finland. Here he did his major work, and he concluded his ministry at the age of sixty-one at Pajala, a neighboring parish.

Laestadius can best be described as a reformer, and he experienced the plight of the reformer in a way which fascinates us in the mid-twentieth century, for he struggled with the fundamentals of social ethics. His ministry actually falls into two phases: reform through a moralistic religion, and reform through the power of God's forgiving grace.

For almost twenty years he fought against the "dragon of liquor" with its destructive consequences of poverty, disease, and spiritual disintegration. He preached the law of God with great vigor and forthrightness, but his efforts seemed only to intensify the vices he was fighting. He succeeded in stirring his people's emotions but failed to break their hard hearts. Two incidents help to illumine his mind in the forty-fourth year of his life. For his pastoral examination he wrote a thesis on "Crapula mundi" (the intoxication of the world) which set forth a devastating criticism of dead religion and corrupt manners among all the social classes of his day. He spared noone. His preaching on the subject offended the sensibilities of many, and he was soon labeled as a wild, fanatic spirit. But something quite different and new came unexpectedly into his life. On a pastoral visitation he met a thirteen-year-old Lapp girl, Maria, who belonged to a religious group of people known as "readers," who gathered to study and to pray over their Bibles and who were sometimes overcome by ecstatic experiences. Following Laestadius' Communion sermon, Maria spoke to him alone and opened her heart. Never before had he heard a testimony like hers on the grace of God. So profound was the

meaning of this conversation that it marked a turning point for his life and ministry. "When I returned home," he wrote later, "there came into my preaching a strange power. . . . Some began to feel restless, . . . hearts turned either more sensitive or harder, and gradually one after another, in increasingly larger numbers, came to the parsonage to seek guidance and comfort." Now he preached against the "liquor dragon" with a new spirit. His church became crowded with anxious hearers. Everything revolved around one main concern: the confession and the forgiveness of sins. The social results were unmistakable: liquor operators, drunkards, prostitutes, and thieves became new creations in Christ. The powerful religious dynamism thus unleashed was in many instances accompanied by ecstatic shouting, dancing, crying, speaking with tongues, and seeing of visions. The authorities took severe action against people involved in abnormal religious activities. Laestadius had a psychological as well as a theological problem on his hands. But he had given much thought to it, for the nature of religious experience and its philosophical implications greatly interested him. "It often happens that a severe spiritual awakening among a people who do not command sufficient power of intelligence to control their passions causes the heart to overflow excessively. . . . But the wise leader can moderate these experiences and bring about self-control if there is confidence in the leader on the part of those who are deeply agitated."

Laestadius-research provides significant material in at least three areas of study: (1) Religious and social criticism, the motivation and the courage to engage in it based on a profound conception of man's existence; (2) The meaning of guilt, and the power of forgiveness as a creative force; (3) The nature of the fellowship which flows from forgiveness, the intimate and spontaneous relations with one another through God's grace. Laestadius lived anew certain aspects of Luther's spiritual struggle and insight into the Gospel, but in the hands of his followers, in the context of nineteenth century Romanticism and Pietism, the structure of Luther's thought suffered serious distortion.

Jacob W. Heikkinen

### Directions in Lutheran Losses to Other Communions

The direction in which the church is moving cannot always be clearly discerned by those who are participants in its life, but wise leadership requires that close attention be given to every straw which indicates the direction of prevailing winds. The suggestion of a current may be seen in available information on the transfer of Lutheran ministers and laymen to other communions. Unfortunately statistics are incomplete and (what is quite as important) wanting in uniformity. Although it is not possible to present a full picture, there is no reason to believe that conclusions based on such scattered information as is available will be entirely misleading.

On the basis of data supplied by the annual *Year Book* of the United Lutheran Church in America and by the minutes of constituent synods of that body, supplemented by personal

knowledge of some cases, it appears that, of the men who withdrew from the ministry of the United Lutheran Church during the last dozen years and who became ministers in other denominations,

12 became Episcopalian (or Anglican)
8 became Presbyterian
5 became Congregational-Christian
4 became Evangelical and Reformed
2 became Unitarian
1 became Reformed Episcopal
1 became Reformed (Dutch)
1 became United Brethren
1 became Methodist

The growing movement of men toward the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Church of England in Canada is in striking contrast to the predominant movement toward the Congregational-Christian churches during the two decades preceding World War II. Then it appears to have been a desire for creedal and doctrinal freedom which moved men. Now it appears to be a desire for episcopal authority and liturgical emphasis. To be sure, personal considerations of various kinds also play a part, and there can be little doubt that the failure of the Protestant Episcopal Church to produce sufficient clergymen for its own needs has provided additional incentive. It needs to be observed in this connection that the swing toward Anglicanism which is suggested by our figures is limited to the territory east of the Mississippi River, and especially east of the Allegheny Mountains, where the Protestant Episcopal Church has its greatest strength. Information which would throw light on transfers from other Lutheran bodies is not now available to the writer.

Another set of figures for the United Lutheran Church may be placed alongside those which pertain to clergymen. According to the 1952 (the most recent) "Report on the Manifest Life of the Congregations," Lutheran laymen transferred their membership to other communions in significantly different proportions. Losses were reported:

| | |
|---|---|
| To the Episcopalians | 193 |
| To the Baptists | 245 |
| To the Evangelical and Reformed | 792 |
| To the Presbyterians | 1,074 |
| To the Methodists | 1,566 |

Here again it needs to be remembered that the statistics are spotty and that a variety of factors played a part in the transfers. Nevertheless, it would appear to be more than mildly curious that Lutheran clergymen tend to move in a direction almost diametrically opposite to that of Lutheran laymen.

Clergymen who are dissatisfied with the faith of the Lutheran Church and who embrace the faith of another communion ought of course to demit the Lutheran ministry. Honesty requires this. (Interestingly, such withdrawals are variously recorded in official records: "dismissed," "dropped from the roll," "deposited ordination papers," "dropped at his own request," etc.) There is nothing particularly alarming in the number of Lutheran clergymen who are demitting. But we are interested here in the possible significance of the direction in which they are moving—and in which many others are presumably moving without actually demitting the Lutheran ministry. A little over a century ago many Lutheran

clergymen in North America adopted the theology and practice of the New Measure movement which they found in their environment. Is there the beginning of a tendency today to adopt the theology and the practice of a neo-Romantic *re*mythologization which is currently flowering in our environment? This is not an idle question, for it is always a sign of weakness rather than strength when the church drifts on what some fondly call "the wave of the future." What such "waves" have done to the Lutheran Church in the past, both in Europe and in America, history amply testifies. This appears to be a time for earnest self-examination.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

# Book Reviews and Notices[1]

*A Basic History of Lutheranism in America.* By Abdel Ross Wentz. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1955. 430 pages. $5.

With the publication of this book Dr. Wentz supplants his widely-used volume entitled, *The Lutheran Church in American History,* first published in 1923 and again in a second, revised edition ten years later. In *A Basic History* the author has enlarged the earlier volume and has brought it up to date factually. Several new chapters which deal with Lutheran cultural and social history have been inserted at appropriate points. These are fortunate additions which strengthen and enrich the presentation. Several sections of the earlier work have been rewritten with the result that a number of subjects receive more adequate coverage. Changes in format have also been made. This new volume omits the study aids which concluded each chapter and which included a list of study questions, topics for special study, personalities recommended for biographical study, and a chapter bibliography. A more attractive book is the result.

Dr. Wentz has a two-fold purpose in writing: "It is intended to furnish an introduction to the history of the Lutheran church and Lutheran people in America. . . . At the same time it is intended to point the way for the more advanced student to carry his studies into greater detail and even into lines of special research" (p. v). In furtherance of the second purpose, as in his earlier volume, he includes a helpful "General Bibliographical Note," in which he characterizes several general histories of American Lutheranism, and a "Selective Bibliography," which provides a guide for further study of the topics covered by each chapter. This bibliography serves as a reminder that there is need for more synodical histories and a host of other specialized studies relating to the history of Lutheranism in America. The spadework which must precede a truly definitive history of American Lutheranism is far from completed.

The author presents the history of Lutheranism in the framework of general American history. This effort is one of the major virtues of the book. Church history is not made in an ecclesiastical vacuum, and if it is written as though it were, something less than justice has been done.

Most readers probably will feel that the treatment of the period since 1910 is the most valuable portion of the book. It is the longest section, in conformity with the author's intent "to focus upon the situation of our own day." In line with that purpose he provides an accessible and integrated summary of recent developments in American Lutheranism in connection with such topics as Lutheran cooperation, union movements among Lutherans, and the relation of Lutherans to the ecumenical movement.

In describing and characterizing the Lutheran synods about which he writes, Wentz is consistently positive in his attitude and appreciative of each group he discusses. In several instances his treatment of individual synods in *A Basic History* is superior to that in the book which it supersedes. This is quite evident, for example, in his discussion of the Missouri Synod and of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, which fact no doubt reflects the appearance of helpful secondary sources in more recent years. The chapter on the American Lutheran Church is rather brief by comparison.

This fine book is somewhat marred by a number of factual inaccuracies, mostly minor in nature, but distracting nevertheless. The following are samples relating to synods of Norwegian background, the segment of American Lutheranism with which the reviewer is most familiar. Information about the colleges and official periodicals of the Evangelical Lutheran Church is incorrect on p. 187 but is correct on pp. 267-8. The Little Norwegian Synod was organized in

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

1918, not 1920 (p. 225). Professor Laur. (Laurentius) Larsen is erroneously given the name of his son, Lauritz Larsen (p. 170). T. O. Burntvedt, not Burndtvedt, is president of the Lutheran Free Church (p. 265).

These and other "bobbles" do not detract from the fact that Dr. Wentz has put American Lutherans of all synods deeply in debt to him by providing such a valuable historical study in up-to-date form. As was the case with its predecessor, this volume will take its place on the bookshelves of pastors and laymen everywhere as a standard source of information about the history of American Lutheranism.

EUGENE L. FEVOLD

*Danish Rebel. The Life of N. F. S. Grundtvig.* By Johannes Knudsen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1955. 239 pages. $3.50.

For a generation or more the name and words of Soren Kierkegaard have been frequently on the lips of American theologians, both Lutheran and other. The name and teachings of his great and contrasting contemporary, N. F. S. Grundtvig, have been less well known and may perhaps never be given the attention which Soren Kierkegaard has received. Professor Johannes Knudsen, former president of Grand View College and Seminary and now at Chicago Lutheran Seminary, has, however, written a book which certainly will help to make both the personality and teachings of Grundtvig "come alive" and demand attention.

The title is well chosen. From his earliest youth Grundtvig was taking his stand in opposition to prevailing trends within the Danish Church. He was, it is true, "a rebel in transition," advocating at one stage what he later denounced—an evidence that his mind and spirit were maturing through the years. But when his life was fully rounded out—he lived to eighty-nine and was active to the last—there is little question as to the basic message of his life and teachings. That message has a strong, though not a wholly uncritical, advocate in Professor Knudsen, whose educational background in Denmark and America and personal theological convictions both help qualify him to give a fuller introduction of Grundtvig to the American theological public.

While giving ample emphasis to Grundtvig's rich and many-sided contributions in such varied fields as fathering the now famous "folk high schools," hymn-writing (he wrote more than 2,000 hymns, of which 200 are included in the official hymnal of Denmark), translating the ancient Sagas, and writing the history of Nordic Mythology, *Danish Rebel* focuses particular attention upon the most crucial issues with which Grundtvig was concerned: the nature of man and man's relation to God and his creation, and the question of the authority through which man can find and live a life in fellowship with God. As to the former question, Grundtvig takes a completely "positive" attitude toward the values of man's life in the world, with no time for "pietism" or asceticism of any kind. As to the latter, he gradually came to the conviction that the real authority upon which the Christian life is built is not the Bible but the church—the church defined not institutionally but dynamically as the fellowship of believers.

It is evident that Dr. Knudsen wishes his book to be not only a contribution to historical and biographical knowledge, but a challenge to the rethinking of some commonly accepted points of view in contemporary American Lutheranism. Through his book he would himself be something of a "Danish-American rebel." In so doing he believes (following the pattern of most Lutheran writers) that he is really leading us back to the "unaltered" point of view of Luther himself. "His emphasis was on the joy and happiness of life, springing out of a genuine appreciation of the created world and of a Pauline and Lutheran recognition that man's salvation and ultimate destiny is taken care of by God. . . . Grundtvig's concept of Christianity not only is in conformity with Luther's basic ideas, but forms the soundest continuation of Luther's great work. This needs to be emphasized today, when a part of the Lutheran church has substituted pagan [sic!], self-righteous, and narrowly exclusive pietism and austere orthodox intellectualism for the original dynamic of the Reformation" (pp. 213 f.).

Professor Knudsen effectively traces

Grundtvig's life through the long pilgrimage of thought and experience which carried him all the way from the Rationalism which prevailed in his youth, through Romanticism, to a personal conversion-crisis to evangelical Christianity, and then onward to a life-long struggle to harmonize the faith which he had made his own with a life fully integrated with that of his own Danish people. In Grundtvig's thinking, as it finally formed itself, Christianity is essentially not individualistic but corporate, not a denial of life but its affirmation, not a separation from one's own people but a deep entering into their life and spirit. In our own day of widespread interest in and discussion of the nature of the church, a day, too, when the question of spiritual authority is again very much to the fore, it is appropriate that the voice of this Danish Rebel should also be heard. One completes Professor Knudsen's book, however, with the feeling that while the basic questions raised are exceedingly pertinent, they deserve answers that are more deep-going than those given. The views of Grundtvig, while valuable as a corrective of some superficial answers given in his day, and in ours, do not convince us that they are an adequate guide for the church of our time between the Scylla of authoritarianism on the one hand and the Charybdis of subjectivism on the other.

BERNHARD CHRISTENSEN

*N. F. S. Grundtvig: An American Study.* By Ernest D. Nielsen. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1955. 173 pages. $2.75.

The author, now president of Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa, wrote his doctoral dissertation at Chicago on the theme, "Grundtvig's Conception of the Development of the History of the Christian Church." Out of such acquaintance with Grundtvig comes this book. It consists of three essays: "On the Trail of the Spirit," "The Spirit in the Church," "The Demand of the Spirit for Freedom"—followed by a "Recapitulation" as a fourth chapter. The book closes with a bibliography and acknowledgments, but no index.

As to content, this study is concerned with finding Grundtvig's basic theme (Nielsen calls it a "concept as a frame of reference for Grundtvig's unsystematic thought") and, having found it, with observing its significance for ecclesiology in Denmark and elsewhere. Hence this study is more in the nature of Lundensian *motivforschung,* thereby raising the question why the sub-title reads "An American Study."

"The selected frame of reference is Grundtvig's absolute faith in spirit." But it is not quite clear what is intended by "spirit," except where the word is capitalized. The author reviews "Grundtvig's efforts to find evidence of spirit" in the periods of history. But it is not explained whether "spirit" means human idealism, religious values, or divine agency. Perhaps it is a vital principle, supra-historical, non-materialistic in essence, or even at times a *Zeitgeist* or a *Volksgeist* —one has to guess.

The richness and variety of Grundtvig's thought overflow the confines of the thesis. His insights are here set forth with considerable fullness and attractiveness. His acute yearning for living reality in the church is revealed in its theological results. Here is an articulation of Grundtvig's thought which is a valuable supplement to the recent more biographical treatments by Hal Koch and Johannes Knudsen.

Yet the result is a treatment on a flat surface; the third-dimensional depth is lost in the studied plan to omit biography and the historical setting. Grundtvig's ideas become abstractions in a most un-Grundtvigian way unless they have something of the heat of the conflict in his own soul and with his opponents.

W. D. ALLBECK

*Ethics of Decision.* By George Forell. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1955. 158 pages. $2.50.

Ethics has to do with living. Christian ethics has to do with the way God intends his people to live. Specifically Christian ethics sees in Jesus Christ the fulfillment both of how we ought to live and also of how we are able to be what we ought to be.

Built into the structure of each age are the fundamental questions which absorb the civilization and the people in it. One such question usually stands out at any given time.

In the Graeco-Roman civilizations of the early Christians it was the end of all things, the question of finality. In the Reformation period it was how to come to terms with God, the Judge of all men.

A book on ethics will be of significant value to any particular people to the extent that it first deals with the basic question of the culture in which these people live. Augustine and Luther are recognized in their own day because they come to grips with the fundamental question in men's minds—whether the men who listened to them were actually aware of the question or not. The worth of George Forell's *Ethics of Decision* is that it is pointed toward the real, though often unasked, questions of our time: "What is the purpose of it all?" "Where is the framework of life?" "Which of all the meanings offered to life is really true?" Or the same questions in more theological and philosophical language: "How do I justify my existence?"

As a good Lutheran, Dr. Forell divides his book into two sections: "The Life of Man under the Law" and "The Life of Man under the Gospel." In doing it, however, he gives more meaning to the terms Law and Gospel and more recognizable (to the non-theological) applications of the uses of the Law than usual in systematic writings.

Part I is the "stuff" of any course in ethics at a state university. Immediacy, Hedonism, Naturalism, Self-realization, Existentialism, Idealism, and the schools of ethics are presented briefly but accurately. Protagoras, Bergson, Kant, Nietzsche, and Mill are a few of the philosophers identified with their systems.

But *Ethics of Decision* is a text for a course in basic Christian ethics and as such adds a critique of all these schools from a Christian perspective. The book is actually a fuller presentation of material contained in a syllabus for basic Christian ethics prepared for the Division of Student Service of the National Lutheran Council. It was used by campus pastors, including the writer of this review, for teaching a course in ethics at Lutheran student centers and schools of religion.

The weakness of the syllabus, however, was that each of Forell's sentences covered material the presuppositions and implications of which needed at least a paragraph or two of exploration. The average student just did not have the background to do meaningful study on his own. As a teaching aid the book is a much more valuable asset than the syllabus.

Part I, however, remains frustrating. The inadequacy of religious as well as secular schools of ethics is forcefully presented. This is done not only from a definitely Christian critique but also in showing the inner inconsistency and untenable presuppositions of the philosophies themselves. The search for the meaning of life is incomplete, but the reader or student is more firmly rooted in his conviction that life must have meaning—even in the face of his own fear of meaninglessness, or his fear of nothing. This first part has also shown that the Christian faith takes seriously his quest for meaning and is ready to listen to the claims of Christ.

Part II is the presentation of the meaning which God in Christ has given to individual and community life. Significantly, the "Life of Man under the Gospel" is dealt with through a presentation of the Ten Commandments. Luther's Catechism and his Treatise on Good Works are the basic source material. The sources may even be used too much. The material is sound in showing the true Christian understanding of the transforming of the Law as a guide for the faithful, but it often gives the impression of expending and defining Luther's thesis rather than answering the searcher's question of the meaning which the Christian faith gives to my own life.

Forell's book is indeed a dynamic presentation of the Christian faith in a way which is relevant to man's predicament in mid-twentieth-century culture. He applies it pointedly without adapting out of recognition. It will be a valuable text for those teaching a course in Christian ethics; it will help every catechist and teacher who deals with the Ten Commandments; and it will be helpful and stimulating to any layman who desires a clear picture of the ways of life struggling for his allegiance and what it means in daily living to have taken the "leap of faith" into the arms of Jesus Christ.

Otto A. Bremer

*Ethics.* By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. 340 pages. $4.

Here is one of the most remarkable books of our generation. Its appearance in English conserves in its fullest form for the world at large the message which a determined young leader of the Confessing Church of Germany wrote with his life-blood. A few months before he was hanged by the Nazis Bonhoeffer wrote from prison: "Sometimes I think I really have my life more or less behind me now and that all that would remain for me to do would be to finish my *Ethics.*" The book was never finished. Some chapters are complete, others not. Some are mere preliminary sketches and outlines. Portions of the study were already in the hands of the Gestapo when Bonhoeffer was arrested and are irretrievably lost. Other portions were recovered from garden hiding-places in the form of innumerable disordered slips of paper which the editor, one of Bonhoeffer's students at the "underground seminary" at Finkenwalde, has painstakingly deciphered and rearranged.

A book produced under such conditions can hardly be expected to contain a coherent and balanced system of ethics. This would not have been the case even if Bonhoeffer had been in position to complete his original project. The author did not proceed according to a fixed plan but developed one separate subject after another trusting that at the end they would all coalesce into a whole by means of an inherent unity. Such a unifying pattern does indeed emerge from the pages of this collection of papers. It is the reality of God in Christ. The usual questions of ethics, "How can I be good?" and "How can I do good?" are discarded as irrelevant. The starting point is a totally different question, "What is the will of God?" "God's commandment is the only warrant for ethical discourse" and this commandment "is the total and concrete claim laid to man by the merciful and holy God in Jesus Christ" (p. 244). "It is never abstract speech *about* somebody" but always "concrete speech *to* somebody" (p. 246). While all other ethics is concerned with the antithesis of *should be* and *is,* with motive and performance, Christian ethics deals with the relation between reality and realization, i.e., the relation between Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. The question of good becomes the question of participation through the Holy Spirit in the divine reality revealed in Christ.

The author applies this point of view consistently to the whole range of ethical problems, individual and social. The kind of answer which it yields in concrete situations of personal conduct may be illustrated by the Christian response to the demand to tell the truth at all times. If we think in terms of abstract laws and principles, we are led to the absurd conclusions drawn by Kant that a man is obliged to give truthful information even to a criminal looking for the man's friend who has concealed himself in his house. There is "truth" that is of Satan, as when a notorious liar for once tells the truth in order to mislead. Participation in reality requires me to perceive who causes me to speak, what entitles me to speak, and in what context I am to speak. Thus when a teacher asks a child in front of the class whether it is true that his father comes home drunk, the fact of the father's drunkenness may be true, but the child is right in denying it and refusing to betray his father. The blame for the lie falls back upon the teacher who had no right to subject the child to such a choice. The child had the right motivation but lacked the ethical maturity to speak "the right word" demanded by the occasion.

The structure of the responsible life is such that a person is never an isolated individual but a deputy, acting in behalf of others. Nor can we divide life into two spheres, the worldly and the religious. "Any static delimitation of a region which belongs to the devil and a region which belongs to Christ is a denial of the reality of God's having reconciled the whole world with Himself in Christ" (p. 70). The world is relative to Christ, whether it knows it or not. This relativeness assumes concrete form in four mandates which God has imposed on all men: labor, marriage, government, and the church. Right living under any of these mandates is impossible apart from Christ. The justification of the sinner by grace alone is the ultimate truth in which the origin and

the essence of the Christian life are rooted. It supplies content and fulfillment to the penultimates, being a man and being God.

Discussion of the problem of church and state by one who met death at the hands of a tyrannical government is especially noteworthy. Government is derived not from natural law or the will of the people but from Christ. Its task consists "in maintaining by the power of the sword an outward justice in which life is preserved and is thus held open for Christ" (p. 306). Unlike the church, "it does not possess the office of confessing and preaching faith in Jesus Christ" (p. 313). The church cannot therefore lay upon the state the duty of pursuing a Christian policy and enacting Christian laws but only of being true government in accordance with its own special task. So long as a government, even an antichristian one, fulfills its divine commission, its claim to obedience must be respected. Disobedience made necessary by a violation of Christian conscience can never be anything but a concrete decision in a particular case and must not be generalized. No specific form of government has an exclusive divine sanction, but that form is relatively best in which the church and the state most clearly perform their own God-given functions. To regard democracy alone as the Christian form of the state blurs the distinction between the offices of church and state and makes only for the secularization of the church. In this way the church is deprived "even of the blessing of suffering and of the possible rebirth which suffering may engender" (p. 41). Bonhoeffer's own decision to leave the safety of New York to bear fearless witness in his homeland is fully consistent with his fundamental outlook. It is difficult, however, to reconcile his participation in the plot to overthrow Hitler, for which he was executed, with his denial of the right to revolution.

Among the other studies contained in the book the most rewarding are the reexamination of the first use of the law from the point of view of the church's total proclamation and the discriminating analyses of the problems of suicide, euthanasia, birth control, and vocation. A true evangelical spirit centering in the living Christ pervades every discussion.

The whole Christian world owes the editor, Eberhard Bethge, and the translator, Neville Horton Smith, a debt of gratitude for preserving this precious legacy from a man who was above all a sincere follower of Christ. It is destined to exert a profound influence upon the study of Christian ethics for many years to come, and it deserves to be read and reread by every servant of the Word.

T. A. KANTONEN

*Kristus Och Hans Kyrka.* By Anders Nygren. Stockholm: 1955. 116 pages. Kr. 5.

This little book on *Christ And His Church* is a remarkably clear and terse statement on the question of the relationship of Christ and the church. The work was prepared as a series of lectures in 1954 at Toronto, and we may, I suppose, expect also an English edition.

A half century ago Harnack tried to differentiate between the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the church about Jesus and until recently it has almost been taken for granted that Christ and the church were quite separable objects of study. Nygren quotes Fridriksen's words that the place of the church in the gospel is a discovery which "is the most remarkable event in the field of exegesis in our generation" (14). Christ and the church are inseparable. What is said of one applies to the other.

For Christ is another word for Messiah and it was faith in the Messiah that explains both Jesus and the church. "If we view realistically the sources of our knowledge of Jesus and the early church, we must admit that we know of no other form of the Christian faith than faith in him as Messiah" (23-24). To deny the supernatural in Christ is only to locate the miracle in the early congregation, making it create something out of nothing. Harnack's view of a kingdom apart from Christ is a reflection of his own environment, not a picture derived from the Gospel.

But this is not to say that Jesus fulfilled the popular expectations regarding a Messiah. Quite the contrary. The idea of the Messiah had become a complex one, a cur-

rent to which many tributaries had contributed. Some of the notions Jesus rejected. Others he transformed. Nygren mentions four elements: a political, nationalistic Messianism, the vision of an eschatological Son of Man (Daniel), the puzzling chapters of Isaiah on the Suffering Servant, the designation of One who was to come. The first Jesus repudiated. He adopted the second as his own title. The third gradually emerged as the most pertinent idea. The fourth was given new meaning by Jesus.

The process by which disciples and people could receive this transformation of a deeply rooted idea was a slow one and only by gradual stages did Jesus reveal His mission in these transformed terms. The full import of the mission of the Suffering Servant could not be published until his death and resurrection had completed it. Neither by word or miraculous deed did Jesus give his generation a chance to set up a kingdom on false foundations—and on their false foundations he could not build.

This interpretation of the Messiah explains his life and death. His baptism is an initiation into the mission of the suffering servant, a baptism into death and resurrection. The temptations are a testing of the obedience of the Servant of God. It was necessary for him to die to fulfill the divine will of a suffering for the sins of the world. Gethsemane was a triumph of obedience to that will. The disobedience of the first man is matched by the perfect obedience of the Son of Man. In the resurrection he is revealed as the Son of God.

"The church is Christ as he is present on earth among us after the resurrection" (82). To be in the church is to participate in him—in word and sacrament, in death and resurrection. His body is a new creation, a new humanity, set in the midst of a dying world. In baptism we are incorporated into his body, in the Lord's Supper we realize his presence. In him we are one in spirit and in love, and in unity with all who are in him.

Unity in the church, thus, is given in fellowship with him. Men do not create it, but they are to manifest it. The unity which Christ's people have in him can be broken neither by schism or heresy as long as Word and Sacrament are present and nourish the life of the Body. But the members of the body are deficient and need to grow in the fullness which will make for wholeness and for unity. As they grow in him they will witness to the true unity of the church.

Some may feel that the book does not provide any plan for advance in the ecumenical movement. But it is good to have a strong, lucid declaration that unity of the church is unity in Christ, and that we will advance as we get closer to the gospel and not as we leave it to the side. It is *in* Christ we will find each other if we are concerned about the unity of the church.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

*Biblical Religion and the Search for Ultimate Reality.* By Paul Tillich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955. 85 pages. $2.25.

In contemporary America, Professor Paul Tillich is probably the theologian's theologian. This reputation he justifies again in this slightly extended version of the James W. Richard lectures delivered at the University of Virginia. In a manner typical for all his thought, he tries to establish the ultimate unity and profound interdependence of biblical religion and philosophical ontology.

This means that the little book represents an introduction to Tillich's life work. It is exactly this unity and interdependence which he attempts to demonstrate in his masterful *Systematic Theology.*

Anybody, therefore, who would like a brief introduction to the theology of Paul Tillich will find this a most helpful and readable book. The author is eloquent in his denunciation of those theologians who "when explaining the concepts of the Old or New Testament writers, use most of the terms created by the toil of philosophers and the ingenuity of the speculative mind and then dismiss with cheap denunciations the work from which their language has been immensely enriched." And he continues, "No theologian should be taken seriously as a theologian even if he is a great Christian and a great scholar, if his work shows that he does not take philosophy seriously."

He then proceeds to state the claims of

biblical religion in all their sharpness. God reveals himself as personal. God related himself to man in a free, personal reciprocity subject to no pre-established rule. God speaks to man. Man is "not supposed to be overpowered by the word, as in sorcery, where the word is used as a physical cause, or in magic, where the word is used as a psychic cause, or in suggestive talk, where the word is used as an emotional cause." He addresses his intellect. The Word informs man about his situation, his actual and ideal relation to God, the world and himself. "But it is also addressed to the will and to the heart of man. It is personal communication."

And the God of biblical religion is Creator. This "emphasizes the dependence on God of everything created and consequently, the essential goodness of creation." At the same time the doctrine of creation "places the created outside of the creative ground." It replaces substantial identity by personal distance.

But biblical personalism reaches its peak in Christology. "It means that God is so personal that we see what he is only in a personal life." And this personal Christ has given meaning to history as well. Biblical religion asserts: "History is neither the expression of man's natural potentialities nor the tragic circle of man's growth and decay; history creates the new. In Christ a new Being has appeared within the world process; history has received a meaning and a center."

But all this is not merely interesting information. It is the call to decision. Man must respond to revelation in faith which is, according to Tillich, "an act of self-surrender, of obedience, of assent." All three are necessary to avoid the intellectualistic and voluntaristic perversions of faith.

After stating the claims of biblical religion succinctly, Professor Tillich uses the last two chapters to indicate the ontological problems implied in such religion. It is his claim that God is "the Ground of Being" in ontology *and* Biblical religion. "The God who is *a* being is transcended by the God who is Being itself, the ground and abyss of every being."

In the opinion of this reviewer, Professor Tillich is at his best when defining the claims of biblical religion and philosophical ontology. He is certainly right when he ridicules those thelogians who pretend that theology can be carried on without the use of philosophical categories. To biblicistic theologians and positivistic philosophers, it must always be said, "The only alternative to metaphysics is bad metaphysics." However, it is not equally obvious that Professor Tillich has been successful in reconciling biblical religion and the search for ultimate reality. Though he has postulated such a reconciliation he has not accomplished it either here or anywhere else. He has succeeded as little as Thomas Aquinas and other distinguished predecessors and for the same reason. It cannot be done. While Tillich says "The God who is *a* being is transcended by the God who is Being itself," the New Testament says that the God who is Being itself *revealed* himself in a being. Tillich wants to go further. Therefore his effort at reconciliation, brilliant, suggestive and inspiring as it is, could be described with two sentences from Soren Kierkegaard's *Fear and Trembling:* "They would suck worldly wisdom out of the paradox. Perhaps one or another may succeed in that, for our age is not willing to stop with faith, with its miracle of turning water into wine, *it goes further,* it turns wine into water."

GEORGE W. FORELL

*Meditations from Kierkegaard.* Translated and edited by T. H. Croxall. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. 165 pages. $3.

A little more than a year ago I had tea at the charming home of Dr. and Mrs. T. H. Croxall in Copenhagen. He was at the time rector of the Anglican church in that city. In the course of the conversation I made the remark that I would like to publish a devotional selection from the *Papers* of Sören Kierkegaard. Dr. Croxall implied that he had presented such a manuscript to the Westminster Press and that it had been accepted for publication. It is now my privilege to review his work, *Meditations from Kierkegaard,* a book which is a valuable contribution to our devotional literature.

While some of the material in this vol-

ume is found in earlier Kierkegaard translations, most of the selections appear for the first time in English translation.

The selections center mainly in the New Testament and are arranged in five parts: I. For Times and Seasons; II. The Sermon on the Mount; III. Some Biblical Personalities; IV. Parables and Miracles of Jesus; V. General. The rubric "general" seems very plain, but it contains some of the finest selections, such as the meditations on The Fatherhood of God and Unconditional Surrender. For each meditation there is first a Scripture passage, then a selection from Kierkegaard, then a prayer selected from the *Works* or *Papers* of Kierkegaard.

Dr. Croxall significantly points out that while Kierkegaard is "a deep philosopher, he is first and foremost a Christian, a penetrating student and exponent of Scriptures; and, above all, a man of prayer and meditation, who as he himself confesses spent time every day in the quiet of his chamber with God" (p. 13).

Few readers of Kierkegaard are familiar with his prayers. Many of these were sketches later used in the edifying and Christian discourses, struggles and joys in the presence of God. He made use of "the prerogative of speaking with God." Therefore he could write, "The Archimedian point outside the world is the prayer-chamber where the true suppliant prays in all sincerity—and he shall move the earth. Yes, if there were such a man, a true suppliant, when he closes his door, it is unbelievable what he then can accomplish" (Papirer IX A 115). Some of the prayers included in the *Meditations* are adaptations by Croxall from the writings of Kierkegaard.

The selections in this book also serve as an introduction into Kierkegaard's interpretation of Scripture. He is not at all concerned about a critical or historical approach to the Scriptures. He regards as hollow sham every inquiry which without a desire to believe "wastes years in trying to get quite literally definite, even to the very dot, what he has to believe" (p. 159). Kierkegaard reads and interprets Scriptures for edification. As an illustration I suggest his notation on Luke 9:59-60. Kierkegaard writes, "The defect in the man in the Gospel who wanted to be a disciple, but must first bury his father, is that he wanted this *first*. He made this a condition; and if this condition were not granted to him, he would not surrender. . . . He ought to have said to Jesus: Even if it is demanded of me that I should let go that which I so eagerly wanted, namely to bury my father—then I do let it go. I give myself unconditionally. This about burying my father is not a condition I make beforehand. No it is a prayer I make to thee *after* I have surrendered myself, asking humbly whether it might be granted." To the word of Jesus, "Let the dead bury the dead" Kierkegaard comments: "God in heaven! see what a proof is here, that Christ has an absolute conception that his cause is the absolute. . . . A mere man would rather commend the filial piety which the disciple here displays. But Christ, and Christ alone had such an absolute cause" (pp. 155-156).

In a few places Dr. Croxall expands and fills out some of the "rough notes" of Kierkegaard. Personally, I question this freedom in dealing with Kierkegaard's texts. However, Dr. Croxall has carefully indicated whenever he has made such alterations. In using one of Kierkegaard's notations (*Papirer* II A 13) he presents two expanded versions, both based upon the same notation (pp. 138 f. and pp. 140 f.). The second of these two selections is by far the better in the sense that it is a more accurate rendering of Kierkegaard's words.

In my estimation *Meditations from Kierkegaard* is a devotional book of great value both for pastors and intelligent laymen. Every selection is thought provoking and leads to self-examination.

REIDAR THOMTE

*On Authority and Revelation. The Book on Adler.* By Søren Kierkegaard. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Walter Lowrie. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955. 205 pages. $4.50.

Walter Lowrie, the translator, has contributed more than any other man to the popularization of Kierkegaard's thought among English-speaking people. The work of a translator is never an easy one, and

more difficult when the work to be translated is an unfinished manuscript. Kierkegaard has been recognized as one of the greatest prose writers in Scandinavia, and as such merits a translation that possesses both diction and accuracy.

In 1843 A. P. Adler, a pastor in the Danish State Church, published a collection of sermons. In the preface he relates how one evening, when he was occupied in the formulation of the doctrine of the origin of evil viewed from Hegelian presuppositions, Christ came to him. From the dictation of Jesus he now wrote down the true doctrine of evil.

Naturally Adler's position was not acceptable to the ecclesiastical authorities. He was suspended from his pastorate and ordered to reply to a number of questions. Since the answers were evasive, he was dismissed from his office with a pension. Three years later Adler published the documents in the case, together with four books. Kierkegaard immediately bought the books, and for the next three months he made a thorough study of them. His intention was to publish a book about Adler, but it never got beyond the stage of a much revised manuscript.

In *The Book on Adler* Kierkegaard made three major revisions. In the translation Mr. Lowrie has incorporated most of the corrections, but he has not carried out the structural changes which Kierkegaard suggested in the third revision. The structure of the book as it appears in the first draft gives the impression that only a person who like Adler receives a special revelation from God is the particular or extraordinary individual. The third revision proposes a structural change which draws the distinction between the particular individual and one, who like an apostle, receives a special revelation (Cf. E. Hirsch, *Kierkegaard-Studien*, p. 852). Failure to take cognizance of this revision in form is not to do justice to the thought of Kierkegaard.

For Kierkegaard Adler was merely a "Nebensach" which served as an occasion. He uses Adler as a means to clarify (a) the dialectical relationship: the universal, the individual, and the particular individual, and (b) the distinction between a genius and an apostle. Adler also served as an epigram upon contemporary Christendom.

I. When the individual by virtue of his own capacities reproduces the established order (the universal) in his own life, he is an ordinary individual whose life is inflected according to the paradigm of the established order. However, he is not merely a word in the series that follows the paradigm. He is free and independent. As a rule, to be such an individual is the highest task of every man (p. 34).

The ordinary individual corresponds to the ethical individual. The ethical as such takes no cognizance of fortune (Lowrie uses the term "luck") or genius, or the differences in life. Ethics recognizes only the universal human tasks, and through its qualitative dialectic it gives the moment a decisive significance (pp. 131-132).

It is the point of departure which distinguishes the extraordinary individual from the ordinary individual. The extraordinary individual sets up new presuppositions and orders his life directly under God, without the mediation of an established order. Due to an ambiguous translation the impression may be given that the ordinary or regular individual renews in himself the established order by introducing a new point of departure. But this is precisely what the regular individual does not do. He submits to the established order and reproduces it in his own life. On the other hand, if he is unwilling to submit to the established order, and instead by introducing a new point of departure he classifies himself immediately under God, he becomes extraordinary. His relationship to the established order is no longer that of reproducing it but of recreating it (p. 34 f.).

The extraordinary or particular individual is no longer in the service of the universal. A man should either serve the universal and "make his life a beautiful and rich and faithful reproduction of the established order" or else he should step out of the ranks and become the extraordinary. The particular individual brings something new from God, and by virtue of his God-relationship he is stronger than the established order (pp. 35, 38).

II. The second insight Kierkegaard gained through the Adler incident was *the qualitative distinction between the genius and the*

*apostle*. The genius belongs in the sphere of immanence, the apostle belongs in the sphere of transcendence. The genius is what he is by virtue of his birth and native ability. Whatever he contributes vanishes in the gradual assimilation of face. Reflection corresponds to genius and lies within the sphere of immanence; faith and the paradox lie within the sphere of transcendence, and can never be assimilated within immanence (pp. 104-106).

The apostle is not born as such. Every man is in a sense equally near to becoming an apostle. The fact that one is an apostle is something that never can be naturalized as a stage within the development of human nature. By virtue of being called by God the apostle is paradoxically different from all other men. The qualitatively decisive factor is the divine authority. Thus as an apostle Paul has no relationship to the genius. "It is thoughtless eloquence to laud Paul as a stylist and for his artistic use of language. . . . As a genius Paul can sustain no comparison with Plato or with Shakespeare, as an author of beautiful similies he ranks rather low" (pp. 104-105). That which qualitatively distinguishes Paul is his apostleship and his divine authority. I am not to listen to Paul because of his brilliance and profundity, but I am to submit to his message because he has authority. Thus, if one who has authority says "Go," and one who has no authority says "Go," the content of the imperatives when aesthetically evaluated is the same in each case. That which makes the distinction is the authority. Authority defies every aesthetical evaluation. "Authority is a specific quality which comes from another place and makes itself felt precisely when the content of the saying or of the action is assumed to be (aesthetically) indifferent" (p. 110). By omitting the word "aesthetically" the translation perverts the entire meaning. From a religious point of view the content of the action is far from indifferent.

The designation "apostle" belongs to the sphere of transcendence. Consequently when men properly relate themselves to an apostle, that relationship is qualitatively different from the relationship to other men. The relationship to the apostle is that of faith. The paradox-religious relationship is something which cannot be thought but only believed (pp. 111-112).

III. The epigrammatic in Adler's position consists in that Adler had become a Christian pastor "without having the least impression of Christianity in the way of becoming a Christian" (p. 230), and when he does become religiously stirred and gets closer to becoming a Christian than ever before, he is dismissed from his pastorate. Kierkegaard points out that within geographical Christendom Christianity has been reduced to culture, and a person is a Christian because he is born of Christian parents just as one is a Jew when born of Jewish parents. However, Judaism is founded upon a natural determinant, the fact of being born of Jewish parents, while Christianity is a determination of the spirit. "One is not *born* to this determinant . . . it is precisely what one must *become*" (p. 182).

The significant contribution of Kierkegaard in this volume is his sharp delineation of the Christian concept of revelation and the consequences of such a concept. Thus, according to Adler's own testimony, he was deeply moved and shaken in his inmost being. But to be profoundly moved is a very indefinite expression for something as concrete as a Christian awakening. To be inwardly moved is a universal foundation for all religiosity. The experience of being stirred, deeply moved, and the inwardness of emotion is a common denominator for the pious Jew, the pious pagan, and the pious Christian. Not every outpouring of emotion is Christian. "The religious emotion which is Christian is qualified by a definition of concepts" (p. 163).

To illustrate: In the case of falling in love, erotically understood, there is no qualitative difference between the experience of a Greek, a Christian, and a Jew. The lyrical expression of love lies within purely human concepts, and every distinction is of a quantitative nature. On the other hand, the religious Christian awakening lies in the sphere of transcendence. In order to express oneself Christianly there is required skill and schooling in the definition of Christian concepts (p. 164).

The translator's notes in the Appendix are

very incomplete and do not at all cover the documentation for the corrections which are incorporated in the text. The Appendix is therefore a very inadequate apparatus for the scholar who might wish to verify the corrections. Quotation marks are not always accurate, and no consistency is observed in the use of parenthesis. Parentheses are used where Kierkegaard used commas, and commas where he used parentheses. In the translator's Preface the documentations on pp. v and vi are incorrect. I take the liberty to correct the following mistranslations since they are of a nature that changes the meanings involved.

P. 7 Kierkegaard says of a premise-author that "his A is not greater than his B." Lowrie translates, "his A is always greater than his B." P. 9, last line and first line of page 10, make no sense due to omission of more than a line where no omission should be made. It should read, "but now comes the comforting reflection that the whole thing is an experiment, and that there is an experiment present. The subject for the experiment is spiritually speaking one who in civil life would be called a very dangerous person." P. 14. Kierkegaard speaking of Adler uses the term "Denmark's Aristophanes"; the translator writes, "Denmark's Aristotle." P. 47, "the trust of Christianity," should be "the truth of Christianity." P. 67, Lowrie translates, "That he is not the elect, that the whole thing about his revelation is a misunderstanding, I shall later show and prove directly." Kierkegaard writes, and in the very correction to which Lowrie refers, "I shall later show and prove but not directly, far be it from me to do so." P. 73, "aprioristic" should be "aphoristic."

P. 83, Lowrie translates, "But a man who begins with a revelation and with the Saviour's dictation has only in an unessential sense to hope for perfectibility—so this is blasphemy." The statement as it stands is a direct contradiction of what Kierkegaard says. It should read: "But a man who begins with a revelation and with the Saviour's dictation can only in an *unessential* sense hope for perfectibility, he must rather fear that the first fact [his revelation] in the course of time may become less vivid in his mind than it was at first. But if such a person presumes in an *essential* sense to hope for perfectibility, then this is blasphemy." No blasphemy is involved if a man only hopes for perfectibility in an unessential sense. P. 93, the translation incorrectly reads, "Even if Adler had not from the first wished it." It should read: "Even if Adler had not made the first claim." The claim is that of having had a revelation. P. 99, Lowrie translates, "he [Adler] does not seem to have quite forgotten." Kierkegaard writes, "he seems to have entirely forgotten." P. 104, first line, "ethical" should be "aesthetical." P. 157, Lowrie translates "the Tower of Babel" where the reference is to the farmer (Luke 12:18) who wanted to build his barns larger. The reference, "this night shall thy soul be required of thee," makes no sense when associated with the Tower of Babel.

The constant translation of the Danish word "Praest" when it refers to a Lutheran clergyman can only be accounted for as an "Anglicanism." It is obvious that a Lutheran clergyman is never spoken of as a priest in this country. In the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* David F. Swenson significantly translates "Praest" with "clergyman."

This book is valuable as a presentation of Kierkegaard's view of revelation with its various implications. I sincerely hope that some of the errors may be corrected in future printings of the book, since it is too significant to suffer from mistranslations.

REIDAR THOMTE

*Christ and His Church.* By Anders Nygren. Translated from the Swedish by Alan Carsten. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956. 125 pages. $2.50.

This rather brief but highly significant volume consists of the Laidlaw Lectures recently established at Knox College, Toronto, Canada, and delivered for the first time by Bishop Nygren in September, 1954. It is admittedly an exposition of a conclusion reached by Nygren in an essay entitled "Corpus Christi" appearing in *En bok om kyrkan* (Stockholm, 1943; translated and published by Muhlenberg Press, 1952, with the title, *This is the Church*). That conclusion was: "The Body of Christ is Christ himself; the

church is Christ as he is present with us and meets us here on earth after his resurrection." (Unfortunately, the edge of that assertion was lost in translation. The Muhlenberg volume has it this way: "The church is Christ, by reason of the fact that since his resurrection he is present with us and meets with us on earth.")

This is really a thrilling and astonishing idea. It is as inadequate and inaccurate to think of Christ apart from the "body" in which he now confronts men in the world as it is to think of Christ apart from the "body" in which he appeared to men in the flesh. If one takes this view seriously one cannot but be impressed by the naturalness with which many biblical concepts fit into the picture without any spiritualizing or allegorizing adaptations. For instance, all the passages dealing with the "body" and "the members"; the vine and the branches; the parallel between Christ and Adam in Romans 5:12 ff.; the concept "in Christ" and its correlatives; and all those words and phrases which have been cited by mystics in support of their view of the Christian life.

The present study is a contribution to the ecumenical problem inasmuch as it attempts to show "how the church has its *ground in Christ* and how this and nothing else is the basis for the *unity of the Church*" (p. 11). In Nygren's view, the task assumed is an essential one if the ecumenical discussion is to prove fruitful. "It is necessary to establish a central meeting ground for all the various communions, so that they can see in what their deepest unity consists. On this foundation—the unity between Christ and his church—the ecumenical discussion must be carried forward, and only in the degree that this central anchoring of the problem succeeds can the discussion be carried forward on common grounds" (p. 11).

The first chapter clears the atmosphere for the central issue. It is a part of Bishop Nygren's genius that he can paint a broad landscape, historically or systematically, with a very few lines. The crucial and significant emerges so quickly in his discussion of trends and developments (one suspects sometimes too quickly to be entirely and comprehensively adequate). The assumptions which were so commonly made at the turn of the century—that Christ and the church were added to the Gospel—has been entirely reversed so far as Christ is concerned, and is being reversed in so far as the church is concerned. The key concept for both Christology and Ecclesiology is the Messiah and the Messianic people (pp. 30 ff.). The next two chapters are devoted to a particularly rich and suggestive exposition of the development of the Messianic concept in the Old Testament in its various forms and the sense in which and the extent to which Christ consciously fulfilled and consciously rejected the Messianic patterns that had developed. The manner in which Christ intentionally attached himself to the Suffering Servant pattern and the closeness of the parallels from his baptism on are particularly impressive. The picture of Christ and of "the Christ-function" (p. 90) which emerges throws light on the nature of the church, for it is in relation to his church that his own nature and function are defined.

The unity between Christ and the church is so close that "it touches upon identity, but it is an identity of a real and not of a conceptual sort" (p. 92). Christ is present "in a *real way* through his Word and sacrament, and by means of these the church *participates in a real way* in all that belongs to Christ; it is participant in a real sense in his death and resurrection" (p. 99 f.). This reviewer finds himself somewhat puzzled here. Is Nygren taking back something of what he has so boldly asserted? If the unity of the church exists at all it must be a *real* unity, and it may be a matter of no great consequence whether we can form adequate concepts of that unity—but may we not try to do so? And if the presence is limited to the Word and sacraments, is it not these rather than the church which constitute the "Body of Christ?" Nygren would surely want to say that it is on account of the Word and the sacraments that the church can be the Body of Christ, and with that we could not argue.

There are some fine insights, too, on the problem of the relation between the church as the Body of Christ and the church as an organized society, both in relation to local congregations and to the ecumenical movement.

Here is the rich product of the consecrated study of one of the great Christian thinkers of our time. No one can read it without realizing that there are tremendous resources of insight and of faith behind it.

EDGAR M. CARLSON

*Essays Philosophical and Theological.* By Rudolf Bultmann. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. 325 pages. $4.75.

It would be a calamity of the worst sort if, because of the controversies now raging over what Bultmann means or does not mean by demythologizing the Gospel, or because of any suspicion of the historical soundness of his exegesis, or for any other reason, one were to forego the profit of reading this book. For those who want to explore the significance of Bultmann's existentialism as it extends beyond his New Testament studies, this book makes exciting reading. This is not to say that the *Essays* are not oriented towards the New Testament. They are, all of them. And they succeed to a marvelous degree in achieving Bultmann's major task: making the faith speak to *our* condition in *our* day. The *Essays* are exactly what they purport to be: theological and philosophical at the same time. The vast learning and keen perceptiveness that lie back of them make one reluctant to be critical of them, lest one appear sophomoric, if not downright sophistical.

Here is something for all students of religion. There is an essay entitled "The Problem of Hermeneutics" for preachers who want to know how to get inside their sermon texts. There is an essay on "The Christological Confession of the World Council of Churches" for the "ecumaniacs" which should give them concern relative to the adequacy of the opening statement of that confession. There is an essay for philosophical theologians entitled "The Question of Natural Revelation" in which he would positively encourage the philosophical quest for God and at the same time insist that "all answers apart from the Christian answer are illusions" (p. 98). Another essay meant for exegetical specialists is entitled "Christ the End of the Law." This does an amazing job of showing the relation between the Law and the Gospel as these functioned in the experience of the apostle Paul. An essay of more general interest is entitled "The Understanding of Man and the World in the New Testament and in the Greek World" which sketches vividly the contrast between the Greek and the New Testament views on the nature of man and of his relation to society, to the world, and to history. Of general interest, too, is "Forms of Human Community," which distinguishes various levels of community, ranging from those based on natural relationships of man and woman, of family, race, and people, through those based on historical heritages and on common participation in the arts and sciences, to those based on religion.

Even if it were possible, given the space and necessary competence, to make critical comments on the *Essays,* one questions whether this would serve any useful purpose. They were not meant to contribute to theological or philosophical debate. Rather they were meant to stimulate appreciative and critical thought over a wide range of interests. Students of literature may be surprised to find a theologian of first rank moving so freely and so surely in the great classical literature of the ancinet past and in the literature of Continental and English-speaking countries.

Bultmann in these *Essays* combines a genuinely humanistic interest with theological and philosophical existentialism as it is developing in our day. One is constantly impressed with the liveliness of style, the brilliant analyses, the precision of language, even in translation. The *Essays* breathe deep evangelical concern. It is a sure bet that preachers who would take the trouble to let this book get under their skins would find their preaching vitalized with new and fresh insights into the meaning of the Gospel for our day.

STANLEY L. OLSEN

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

*Editor*

THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

*Managing Editor*

A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

*Book Editor*

WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

*Circulation Manager*

PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

## EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Gettysburg, Pa.

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa.

Augustana Theological Seminary
Rock Island, Ill.

Capital University Theological Seminary
Columbus, Ohio

Wartburg Theological Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Luther Theological Seminary
St. Paul, Minn.

Augsburg Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Central Seminary
Fremont, Neb.

Chicago Lutheran Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada
Waterloo, Ont.

Grandview Seminary
Des Moines, Iowa

Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio

Lutheran Seminary
Saskatoon, Sask.

Northwest Lutheran Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Southern Lutheran Seminary
Columbia, S. C.

Suomi Seminary
Hancock, Mich.

Trinity Seminary
Blair, Neb.

Pacific Lutheran Seminary
Berkeley, Calif.

VOLUME VIII

1956

Times and News Publishing Co.

# Index to Volume VIII

## I. AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS


AHLEN, A. C. M.
Review of: Kimpel, *Faith and Moral Authority* — 91
ALLBECK, WILLARD D.
Reviews of: Lueker, ed., *Lutheran Cyclopedia* — 86
Nielsen, *N. F. S. Grundtvig: an American Study* — 367
ARDEN G. EVERETT
Reviews of: Fey, *The Lord's Supper* — 182
May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* — 275
AUS, GEORGE
What Does a Sacrament Proffer? — 142
BAGGER, HENRY H.
The Place of the Sermon in Public Worship — 195
Review of: Lindemann, *Dead or Alive* — 192
BAUGHMAN, HARRY F.
Review of: Wedel & McCray, eds., *Go Preach* — 192
BELGUM, DAVID
Review of: Lauterbach, *Ministering to the Sick* — 273
BERKEMEYER, WILLIAM C.
Review of: Finegan, *Clear of the Brooding Cloud* — 274
BERG, JAMES P.
For You and for Many—Yes, Both — 268
BERGENDOFF, CONRAD
Reviews of: Holmquist, *Handbok i svensk kyrkohistoria,* II, III — 86
Nygren, *Kristus och hans kyrka* — 370
BOYD, ROBERT H.
Review of: Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* — 81
BREMER, OTTO A.
Review of: Forell, *Ethics of Decision* — 367
BUEHRING, PAUL H.
William Frederick Lehmann — 51
BURGESS, ANDREW S.
Review of: Birkeli, *Politikk og Misjon* — 92
BURTNESS, JAMES H.
Reviews of: Kantonen, *The Christian Hope* — 176
Heick, *Guide to Christian Living* — 177
CAEMMERER, RICHARD R.
The Office of Overseer in the Church — 3
CARLSON, EDGAR M.
Reviews of: Shepherd, *At All Times and in All Places* — 185
Nygren, *Christ and His Church* — 376
CARTFORD, GERHARD M.
Reviews of: *The Choirmaster's Yearbook,* IV — 188
*The Children's Hymnal* — 187
CHRISTENSEN, BERNHARD
Review of: Knudsen, *Danish Rebel: Life of N. F. S. Grundtvig* — 366
CONRAD, LESLIE, JR.
Lutherans and Non-Denominational Youth Movements — 341
DOBERSTEIN, JOHN W.
Translation of: Justification and the Discipline of Liturgics — 43
EVENSON, C. RICHARD
Review of: Sherrill, *The Gift of Power* — 183
FEVOLD, EUGENE L.
Review of: Wentz, *A Basic History of Lutheranism in America* — 365
FORELL, GEORGE W.
Work and the Christian Calling — 105
Review of: Tillich, *Biblical Religion and the Search for Reality* — 371
FRERICHS, WENDELL W.
Review of: Parrot, *Discovering Buried Worlds* — 82

GARHARD, J. D.
Flew & Macintyre, eds., *New Essays in Philosophical Theology* ... 287
GRANSKOU, DAVID M.
Review of: Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror* ... 173
GRIMSTVEDT, CLYDE J.
Review of: Kauffman, *The Challenge of Christian Stewardship* ... 275
GRONLI, JOHN E.
Reviews of: Nida, *Customs and Cultures* ... 95
Reichelt, *Meditation and Piety in the Far East* ... 95
HALVERSON, JOHN V.
Reviews of: Leslie, *Jeremiah* ... 80
Wallis, *Young People's Hebrew History* ... 281
HANSON, JAMES H.
Review of: Bonhoeffer, *Life Together* ... 284
HARRISVILLE, ROY A.
Is the Coexistence of the Old and New Man Biblical? ... 20
HARVA, URPO
Human Suffering and God's Sovereignty ... 99
HEICK, OTTO W.
Review of: Bienert, *Die Arbeit nach der Lehre der Bibel* ... 179
HEIKKINEN, JACOB W.
Life and Thought in World Lutheranism: Finland ... 360
HEIM, RALPH D.
Review of: Corson, *The Christian Imprint* ... 96
HEINECKEN, MARTIN J.
The Divine Service as Witness and Confession ... 150
Faith and Facts ... 253
HERTZ, KARL
Review of: Casserley, *The Bent World* ... 279
HOKENSON, RODNEY
The Awakening of Political Responsibility Among German Protestants ... 296
HULME, WILLIAM E.
Review of: Oates, *Anxiety in Christian Experience* ... 274
JENSEN, THEODORE I.
Review of: Long, *Conscience and Compromise* ... 179
KANTONEN, T. A.
Reviews of: Harkness, *Foundations of Christian Knowledge* ... 277
Bonhoeffer, *Ethics* ... 369
KEITER, HERMAN
Review of: Trueblood, *Dawn of the Post-Modern Era* ... 280
KNAUS, EARL T., JR.
God's Lonely Men ... 119
KNUDSEN, JOHANNES
Life and Thought in World Lutheranism: Denmark ... 69
KOENKER, ERNEST B.
Ideology Versus Religion—No Tactical Blunders ... 75
LARSEN, ROBERT W.
Review of: Pelikan, *Fools for Christ* ... 176
LEVIE, DAGOBERT DE
Patriotic Activity of Calvinistic and Lutheran Clergymen During the American Revolution ... 319
LUTNES, R. W.
Reviews of: Berstl, *The Cross and the Eagle* ... 285
Mand, *The Unfaithful* ... 285
MENGERS, ETHAN
Review of: Napier, *From Faith to Faith* ... 79
MUEDEKING, GEORGE H.
Reviews of: Ferm, ed., *Dictionary of Pastoral Psychology* ... 272
Hulme, *How to Start Counseling* ... 272
MYERS, JACOB M.
The Yonan Codex ... 168
Reviews of: Lewy, *The Growth of the Pentateuch* ... 172
Parrot, *The Flood and Noah's Ark* ... 285
Parrot, *The Tower of Babel* ... 285
NAGEL, WILLIAM
Justification and the Discipline of Liturgics ... 43
NELSON, E. CLIFFORD
Review of: Flew & Davies, eds., *The Catholicity of Protestantism* ... 181

NELSON, OLOF H.
"For You" and "For Many" ... 61
NESS, JOHN M.
Review of: Bowman, *The Drama of the Book of Revelation* ... 286
NIELSEN, NIELS C., JR.
Roman Catholic Magisterium and the Analogy of Being ... 213
NYHOLM, PAUL C.
Reviews of: Preus, ed., *Norsemen Found a Church* ... 276
Bromiley, ed., *Zwingli and Bullinger* ... 277
OLSEN, STANLEY L.
Reviews of: Runes, ed., *Treasury of Philosophy* ... 277
Garnett, *Religion and the Moral Life* ... 278
Bultmann, *Essays Philosophical and Theological* ... 378
RAND, SIDNEY A.
Review of: Roberts, *The Grandeur and Misery of Man* ... 188
RAUN, JAMES J.
Review of: DeWolf, *A Theology of the Living Church* ... 282
REUMANN, JOHN
Martin Werner and "Angel Christology" ... 349
RILLING, JOHN F.
Review of: Motter, ed., *Great Preaching Today* ... 189
ROGNESS, ALVIN N.
This Is the Preacher's Hour ... 291
ROTH, ROBERT PAUL
A Rebuttal on India ... 74
Heresy and the Lutheran Church ... 245
SARDESON, JOHN H.
Review of: Horton, *Christian Theology* ... 88
SCHOTT, GEORGE F.
Review of: Hong, *The World and the Church* ... 181
SELTZER, GEORGE R.
Review of: Messenger, *The Medieval Latin Hymn* ... 186
STAMM, RAYMOND T.
Keeping the Faith Abreast With the Times ... 258
Reviews of: Grant, *The Sword and the Cross* ... 83
Easton, *Early Christianity* ... 85
STEIMLE, EDMUND A.
Reviews of: Rogness, *Who Shall Be God* ... 191
Kay, *The Nature of Christian Worship* ... 186
STORAASLI, OLAF K.
Review of: Neill, *The Rediscovery of the Bible* ... 175
STOUDT, JOHN JOSEPH
John Staupitz on God's Gracious Love ... 225
STROUP, HERBERT
Professionalism and the Christian Faith ... 33
TAPPERT, THEODORE G.
Life and Thought in World Lutheranism: America ... 165, 362
Reviews of: Myklebust, *Study of Missions in Theological Education* ... 93
Pelikan, ed., *Luther's Works,* XII ... 170
THOMTE, REIDAR
Reviews of: Croxall, *Meditations from Kierkegaard* ... 372
Kierkegaard, *On Authority and Revelation* ... 373
TILLMANS, WALTER T.
Reviews of: Hillerdal, *Gehorsam gegen Gott und Menschen* ... 90
Lindemann, *Martin Luther* ... 281
WAHLSTROM, ERIC H.
Life and Thought in World Lutheranism: Sweden ... 359
Reviews of: Josefson, *Bibelns Auktoritet* ... 89
Chan, *Religious Trends in Modern China* ... 94
WALDUM, H. PEDER
Review of: *The Interpreter's Bible,* III ... 171
WOLF, C. UMHAU
Review of: Hahn, *Old Testament in Modern Research* ... 174
YOCHUM, HAROLD L.
Review of: Jones, *On Being Your Best* ... 190

# II. BOOKS REVIEWED


Bauman, *To See Peter* ..... 282
Bienert, *Die Arbeit nach der Lehre der Bibel* ..... 179
Berstl, *The Cross and the Eagle* ..... 285
Bonderud & Lutz, *America's Lutherans* ..... 96
Bonhoeffer, *Life Together* ..... 284
———, *Ethics* ..... 369
Bowman, *The Drama of the Book of Revelation* ..... 286
Bromiley, ed., *Zwingli and Bullinger* ..... 277
Bultmann, *Essays Philosophical and Theological* ..... 378
Casserley, *The Bent World* ..... 279
Chan, *Religious Trends in Modern China* ..... 94
*Children's Hymnal, The* ..... 187
*Choirmaster's Yearbook, The,* IV ..... 188
Corson, *The Christian Imprint* ..... 96
Croxall, *Meditations From Kierkegaard* ..... 372
DeWolf, *A Theology of the Living Church* ..... 282
Easton, *Early Christianity* ..... 85
Fey, *The Lord's Supper* ..... 182
Ferm, ed., *Dictionary of Pastoral Psychology* ..... 272
Finegan, *Clear of the Brooding Cloud* ..... 274
Flew & Davies, eds., *The Catholicity of Protestantism* ..... 181
Flew & Macintyre, eds., *Essays in Philosophical Theology* ..... 287
Forell, *Ethics of Decision* ..... 367
Garnett, *Religion and the Moral Life* ..... 278
Grant, *The Sword and the Cross* ..... 83
Hahn, *Old Testament in Modern Research* ..... 174
Harkness, *Foundations of Christian Knowledge* ..... 277
Heick, *Guide to Christian Living* ..... 177
Hillerdal, *Gehorsam gegen Gott und Menschen* ..... 90
Holmquist, *Handbok i svensk kyrkohistoria,* II, III ..... 86
Hong, *The World and the Church* ..... 181
Horton, *Christian Theology* ..... 88
Hulme, *How to Start Counseling* ..... 272
*Interpreter's Bible,* III ..... 171
Jones, *On Being Your Best* ..... 190
Josefson, *Bibelns auktoritet* ..... 89
Kantonen, *The Christian Hope* ..... 176
Kauffman, *The Challenge of Christian Stewardship* ..... 275
Kay, *The Nature of Christian Worship* ..... 186
Kierkegaard, *On Authority and Revelation* ..... 373
Kimpel, *Faith and Moral Authority* ..... 91
Knudsen, *Danish Rebel: Life of N. F. S. Grundtvig* ..... 366
Lauterbach, *Ministering to the Sick* ..... 273
Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror* ..... 173
Leslie, *Jeremiah* ..... 80
Lewy, *The Growth of the Pentateuch* ..... 172
Lindemann, Henry, *Martin Luther, Man of God* ..... 281
———, Herbert, *Dead or Alive* ..... 192
Long, *Conscience and Compromise* ..... 179
Lueker, ed., *Lutheran Cyclopedia* ..... 86
Mand, *The Unfaithful* ..... 285
May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* ..... 275
Messenger, *The Medieval Latin Hymn* ..... 186
Motter, ed., *Great Preaching Today* ..... 189
Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education* ..... 93
Napier, *From Faith to Faith* ..... 79
Neil, *The Rediscovery of the Bible* ..... 175
Nida, *Customs and Cultures* ..... 95
Nielsen, *N. F. S. Grundtvig: an American Study* ..... 367
Nygren, *Kristus och hans kyrka* ..... 370
———, *Christ and His Church* ..... 376
Oates, *Anxiety in Christian Experience* ..... 274
Parrot, *The Flood and Noah's Ark* ..... 285
———, *The Tower of Babel* ..... 285
———, *Discovering Buried Worlds* ..... 82

Pelikan, *Fools for Christ* ..... 176
———, ed., *Luther's Works,* XII ..... 170
Preus, ed., *Norsemen Found a Church* ..... 276
Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* ..... 81
Reichelt, *Meditation and Piety in the Far East* ..... 95
Roberts, *The Grandeur and Misery of Man* ..... 188
Rogness, *Who Shall Be God* ..... 191
Runes, ed., *Treasury of Philosophy* ..... 277
Shepherd, *At All Times and in All Places* ..... 185
Sherrill, *The Gift of Power* ..... 183
Tillich, *Biblical Religion and the Search for Reality* ..... 371
Trueblood, *Dawn of the Post-Modern Era* ..... 280
Wallis, *Young People's Hebrew History* ..... 281
Wedel & McCray, eds., *Go Preach* ..... 192
Wentz, *Basic History of Lutheranism in America* ..... 365

## III. LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

America: European Views of Lutheran Church Life in America ..... 165
A New International Journal of Lutheran Theology ..... 166
The Yonan Codex ..... 168
Directions in Lutheran Losses to Other Communions ..... 362
Denmark: The Folk Church in Denmark ..... 69
Finland: Lars Levi Laestadius ..... 360
Sweden: Methodology in Sweden ..... 359